The Nation

Vol. CIV NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1917 No. 2691

The Week

MR. BALFOUR'S note supplementary to the joint reply of the Allies to President Wilson is, at first sight, a little puzzling. Was it that the new English Foreign Secretary could not refrain from trying his pen? A master of dialectics, it is easy for Mr. Balfour to make great play with Germany's treaty-breaking and terrorism. But this has been done a thousand times before. That could scarcely have been Mr. Balfour's main object. It is to be found, we believe, in his effort to get more clearly before the American public exactly what is meant by expelling Turkey from Europe. In the formal Allied reply this was stated in bare words as one of the objects of the war. In Mr. Balfour's note it is skilfully expanded. His picture of Turkish power in its worst forms made use of by German intrigue to carry back the Turkish flag into lands whence it was long ago expelled, and to threaten fresh enslavement to peoples who had fought their way free of Turkish rule, is well fitted to appeal to the traditional humane feeling on this subject in the United States. More explicit than the Allied note Mr. Balfour also is in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine and the unredeemed provinces of Italy. When it comes to the question of the guarantees of lasting peace after the war is won by the Allies, the writing of the Foreign Secretary seems as elusive as it was in his celebrated book, "The Foundations of Belief."

CARDINAL MERCIER has received the strongest assurance that in his protest against the cruelty of the Belgian deportations he has the support of the head of the Catholic Church. In a letter from Cardinal Gaspari, the Papal Secretary of State, the Belgian primate is told that the Pontiff has not only already pleaded with the Imperial German Government in behalf of the people "so harshly put to trial," but "will do everything in his power in order that an end may be put to the deportations, and that those who have already been carried off far from their country may soon be back amidst their mourning families." Whether or not these words of the Pope will be permitted to reach the ears of the German people, there is no doubt that they will have ample access to the people of neutral nations, and they will make more difficult than ever the attempt of the German authorities to put a color of decency upon the atrocity. The only way in which the outraged public sentiment of the world can be at all placated is by a yielding to its demands—by an end of the deportations and a return to their homes of those who have already been dragged away into foreign servitude.

TO read the defence of Belgian deportations just issued by the German Government, one would think that Germany was in Belgian territory on a purely benevolent mission. She was, as it were, accidentally informed of the fact that thousands of Belgians were out of work and out of food, and in a philanthropic spirit invited them to go freely to Germany to labor at high wages. That the German authorities fancy that anybody can be deceived by this kind of smoothing over of a monstrous wrong only shows how they have yielded to a strong delusion. The defence expresses the pained fear that "high personages" may be misled by distorted versions of what Germany has been doing in Belgium. One of these high personages is the Pope, and he has already joined his voice to that of the noble Cardinal Mercier in solemn protest against the forced removal of Belgian workingmen. The German defence fights very shy of the law of the case, but in the act betrays itself. Inasmuch as, according to its own statement, the deported Belgians are not compelled to do "work of a military character," it plumes itself on conforming to "international law." But the international law which forbids that kind of employment also forbids forced labor of any kind, except for the immediate needs of the occupying army. Moreover, the German defence innocently speaks of German "requisitions" of the machinery in Belgian workshops. This can only mean the sending of that machinery to Germany—another violation of international law. Most unluckily timed is the publication in America of this hollow German defence. It coincides with the return of Mr. Hoover, of the Belgian Relief Commission, who tells his countrymen that the needs and misery of Belgium, under German occupation, are to-day more pitiful and appealing than ever.

IN the game of hide and seek now being carried on in the Atlantic Ocean between the German raider and the British and French naval vessels, the honors are clearly with the German ship. It is self-evident that the raider has already caused so much damage that if she is now sunk she will go down to history as one of the Kaiser's most profitable investments. Not only is the destruction of vessels so great that it is admitted in London that it will be severely felt, but the indirect consequences of the disturbance of traffic are certain to be extremely costly. Until the raider is located there must be anxiety and delay in every part of the ocean. As she is reported to have been last seen ten days ago, she may turn up three thousand miles away to-morrow. Coal she has in plenty as the result of her captures. Indeed, there is nothing to prevent her imitating the Confederate cruiser Shenandoah and going around Cape Horn to strike at the rich cargo ships of the Pacific—even at the munition ships plying between our Pacific Coast ports and Vladivostok—unless she should accidentally run into a British or Japanese cruiser. The Moewe got safely back to her home port, and it is possible that her successor may strive to follow her example. The Greif, it will be remembered, was not so fortunate, and was sunk on her way out. Indeed, we shall have to wait until the end of the war to hear how many ships tried to run the gantlet before we can judge how efficient the blockade has been.

IN such an ocean game of hare and hounds the odds favor the hare, as the Confederate cruisers showed. What had been expected was, however, that the wireless would so alter the situation as to make it infinitely harder for the hare to double on the pursuers. It was thought that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it takes only a few seconds to send out an S. O. S. call any captured ship unless entirely surprised could send a hasty warning even if she had to haul down her flag immediately thereafter. The Moewe on several occasions got alongside her victims by strategy and then threatened to sink the prizes if the wireless sputtered a single syllable. In such cruiser warfare every ruse is allowable, and there is no more reason to take exception to this German's sailing under the British flag or hoisting a flag of distress than there was to attack Captain Semmes for regularly resorting to these same practices. We should have no reason to complain if this were happening right at our doors, for this cruiser appears to be doing what the submarines cannot except in sight of land—safeguarding the lives of the captured crews in the historic fashion of sending them into port in a captured ship, precisely as the Confederates used to do. Whatever the fate of the present raider, her career will again hearten the Germans and encourage many of them to think that they can really drive England to the wall by the use of their sea-power. Fantastic as this seems, they are at least entitled to say that in this war, as many English writers admit, the palm for initiative, daring, and enterprise at sea belongs to them and not to the English, despite all their centuries of naval tradition.

PRECISELY because the one task which confronts Lloyd George is the winning of the war for the Allies, he cannot afford to lose much time in bringing about a settlement in Ireland. It is not simply that Ireland is the first and natural rejoinder for Germany to fling back in the face of the Allies whenever the latter speak of the rights of small nationalities. Ireland is a war problem for the Allies. What are the three principal objects to which the belligerent Powers must bend their efforts? To avert domestic discontent, to increase their military strength, and to win neutral sympathy. Ireland lies astride every one of these three problems for Great Britain. The rebellion of last spring and its aftermath have lamed England's efforts. Irish discontent has hampered recruiting. By calling to the colors half of her farming population under the age of twenty-six, England expects to add 60,000 men to her armies, and this at a time when the maintenance of her resources of domestic food is a very pressing problem. Two times that number of men would be won from a reconciled Ireland, if we count new recruits and the large garrison forces now employed in the island which would be released for service at the front. Finally, we only have to imagine the effect on opinion in this country of a generous settlement of the Irish question. The alliance between Irish and German sympathizers, which constitutes the backbone of anti-British sentiment in this country, would be ended.

PRESIDENT LOWELL of Harvard continues to be one of the best "boosters" of unpopular causes. It will be remembered that he made Mrs. Pankhurst a popular heroine in 1911 by excluding her from the sacred college buildings—if he could only have foreseen that she would be a vital prop to the Throne in the present war! As a result, Mrs. Pankhurst's meeting across the street from the College was not only crowded to the doors, but turned away hundreds. Now it is Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington whom Mr. Lowell has generously brought into the limelight by what a correspondent of the *Crimson* calls a reversion "to an unsound and discarded policy." The day before Mrs. Skeffington's meeting Mr. Lowell withdrew the permission given to her by the college office to speak in a college building, on the ground that the "college halls are not to be used for propaganda." Now, it is only by a liberal stretching of the definition that Mrs. Skeffington's lecture could be termed propaganda, for she is not preaching Irish rebellion, nor pro-Germanism, nor anything else to shock the blue-blooded Back Bay conservatives of Harvard. Her lecture tour is in the interests of the peace cause, that of universal suffrage, and of labor. She tells her terrible story of British military crime—including the murder of her innocent husband—with such amazing self-restraint and freedom from bitterness that we cannot but feel that every Harvard undergraduate would profit greatly if he should be ordered to hear her.

NOW, as a result of this action of President Lowell, there is a widespread charge that Mrs. Skeffington was excluded because she dares, wicked person that she is, to criticise the British Government. It is pointed out that Capt. Ian Hay Beith, described publicly in Cambridge as "having been sent to this country by the British Government to explain Britain's part in the war," was welcomed by Sanders Theatre and allowed to charge admission for his "propaganda" on behalf of his cause. If both were clearly propagandists, then both should have been excluded. We agree with Mr. W. T. Fisher, a recent graduate of Harvard, who writes to the *Crimson* that, "if the University allows every expression of opinion, both from its faculty and from lecturers brought by the student organizations, it cannot be accused of giving support, as a university, to the opinions of any. On the other hand, as soon as we begin to pick and choose, we lay ourselves open to misconstruction, and, to my mind, well-founded adverse criticism." There is one slight technicality in Mr. Lowell's favor. In Mrs. Skeffington's case it was erroneously announced in certain newspapers that the lecture was to be open to the public. This was an error of the press, but it gave Mr. Lowell an excuse, perhaps, for his official ruling against Mrs. Skeffington. It is naturally to be regretted that, just when Harvard is asking for ten millions more for her endowment, the impression should again go abroad that she is not seeking the truth, that she is excessively partisan towards the war, and limits free speech in accordance with the sympathies of her authorities.

BY the acquisition of the Danish West Indies the sovereignty of the United States is extended over a territory a little less than half the area of Greater New York with a population of about 30,000. In the broken land bridge which sweeps from Florida to Yucatan to the mouth of the Orinoco enclosing the Caribbean Sea, the heavy piers, Cuba, Haiti, and Porto Rico, begin to taper off into the causeway of the lesser Antilles precisely in the group of the Virgin Islands of which the Danish Islands are a part. The military reasons for our purchase of the islands are negative. It is not that the United States needs them for naval stations, with Porto Rico only a stone's throw away. The fear is that with these islands on the market some other Power might step in. And since Great Britain and France are already well established on the Caribbean, the implication is Germany, of course. To the Imperialist vision, no doubt, the acquisition of the Danish islands will be a forward step

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a process that can only end with Trinidad and the South American mainland. When it comes to conjuring up a menace for the Panama Canal, the British in Barbados or the French in Guadalupe and Martinique will serve the purpose.

IT is not everybody who can have a Rear-Admiral for personal medical attendant. In nominating Dr. Grayson of the Medical Corps to be promoted to that rank, President Wilson has acted within his legal rights—just as he has in disregarding the rule of seniority in other naval nominations made at the same time—but has stirred up a hornet's nest in Washington. No one has a word to say against Dr. Grayson. He is a fine man and a competent physician. His advice and friendship have done wonders for Mr. Wilson's health. But it is roundly asserted in Washington that he would never have been jumped over the heads of 137 officers, his seniors, had it not been for the President's favor. People will be adapting the lines of Sir Joseph Porter and will be making Dr. Grayson say that he polished up the President so carefullee that now he is Admiral in the U. S. navee.

ALTHOUGH Chief Justice White and Justices McKenna and Clark dissented from the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the broad interpretation of the Mann White Slave act, it is difficult to see how any other conclusion could be arrived at than that registered by the Court. The decision was based on the apparently complete absence of ambiguity in the language of the act. The law declares, among other things, that it shall be a felony knowingly to have any part in the transportation, in interstate or foreign commerce, of "any woman or girl for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery or any other immoral purpose." It is quite certain, indeed, that few, if any, of the members of Congress who voted for the bill expected it to be applied to ordinary cases of sexual immorality or intrigue; and the title by which the law is designated—the White Slave act—shows that it was only systematic or commercialized vice that was avowedly aimed at in its enactment. So strong is the evidence of this that we may presume that the dissenting judges felt the case to be one in which our ordinary rule of interpretation —the rule that where the language of a law is on its face perfectly clear, outside evidence of intent is not to be considered—must be set aside in favor of the "rule of reason."

A DIRECT way of bringing help to Mexico has been suggested by a committee for the study of educational problems in Mexico under the chairmanship of the president of the University of Cincinnati; it includes among its members the heads of Johns Hopkins, of the University of Chicago, of Oberlin, and men of the standing of John Bassett Moore and David Starr Jordan. The committee has issued an appeal for the establishment of an independent college in Mexico, and Chairman Dabney cites as a model Robert College at Constantinople. Here is a specific example of how a single wealthy American or a single American philanthropic agency might at a stroke translate our good wishes into concrete form. And it would not be a service to Mexico only. It would be a throwing out of the first thread in the web of friendship between the two countries. Mexico offers to-day something of the same opportunity for service which has drawn so many young Americans to the war hospitals of Europe. We are convinced that the response for workers would come if American organizing genius devoted itself to devising methods of help, and if American wealth stepped forward readily and generously. There is no need of waiting for the military problem of the republic to adjust itself completely. By getting at the work of reconstruction we should hasten the end of civil war.

OPEN intimation in Washington that if Mr. Perkins means to make himself in any degree a boss of the Republican party, he is in for a severe disappointment, is a natural result of the tactics he has been pursuing. The party is in sore need of a housecleaning, a rejuvenation which shall leave it worthy of the confidence of progressives of whatever connection. But Mr. Perkins's activities do not impress onlookers as being directed primarily to that end. Is he fighting for principles or for a principal place in the house to which he has returned? Is the bone of contention what the Republican party shall stand for, or only whether it shall "stand for" Perkins? At present, there is a decidedly artificial look to the war he is waging. Calling names and issuing threats are unpleasantly reminiscent of 1912, to which, indeed, he makes specific references. A leader of unquestioned unselfishness might make the appointment of Vice-Chairman Adams the occasion for a contest over issues, in which there would be no suggestion of personal interest. But it is the simple truth that Perkins is not the man to undertake such a contest. He has never been accepted unreservedly by even the radical Progressives; his influence was due to the fact that he enjoyed the Colonel's favor. It is not at all certain, therefore, that his present activities will not do more harm than good to the cause which he professes to have at heart. They would be more impressive if they had enlisted the endorsement of such men as Borah and Cummins, instead of the more explosive Progressives.

FRANKNESS is suggested by Dean Briggs as a means of clarifying the fog surrounding the question of amateur standing in college athletics. According to the agreement among Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, the University Committee on Eligibility may decide "cases involving unintentional, technical, or trivial violations" of the rule against playing for money. Investigation of cases falling under this provision is not easy, but at least "students knew where they stood, whether what they did in summer threatened or did not threaten their amateur standing." They knew all the better if they were candid with the Committee, for which Dean Briggs says: "We have encouraged students to be open with us, and have tried not to be unreasonable with them." He recurs to the point a little later, when he remarks, "Discrimination is not very hard if men will tell the truth." But he has not been a college disciplinarian for nothing, and he recognizes that "there are ways of fooling the college authorities." A successful attempt to fool them, if it is known to students, naturally discourages frankness. Nevertheless, "most college men will tell the truth if they believe that people trust them and try to use them squarely, and many will tell it to their own condemnation." The moral is one for college authorities fully as much as for students. It confirms the public's impression that the difficulties connected with preserving amateurism have been magnified. What the question has needed all along was frankness and common-sense, and not merely rules.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wilson the Idealist

THERE are two theories of the President's course in reading to the Senate on Monday the statement which he had previously transmitted to our Ambassadors in Europe, to be by them laid before the various Governments. One is that he was acting upon diplomatic intimations or even promptings which had come to him. It may be that his remarkable utterance was, in a way, invited. But the other and more probable theory is that he was self-moved. Convinced that he had a message to give to a world hungry for it, believing that he had it in his power to make a voice from America penetrate to every hamlet of the belligerent countries, Mr. Wilson calmly ignored precedents, swept away conventions, and said the thing he had to say without a tremor. Either way it was splendid intrepidity. Yet all was done so quietly, so without pose or rant, that it is hard to realize the magnificent audacity it required in the President.

The President's word to the nations was frankly that of an idealist. Upon many of his expressions it would be easy for criticism to pounce. Some of the doctrines which he enunciates so sweepingly, go counter to American practice—counter to his own practice. And some of the principles which he lays down for a settlement of the European war would, we fear, seem to the actual members of a peace conference as barren, or as little applicable in detail, as a proposition in geometry. But we are not going to dwell upon these things to-day. The main impression made by the President is too deep, too inspiring, to be weakened by fault that may be found with this or that feature of his programme.

We believe, also, that study and the event will show that there is a vein of practical sense in the idealism of the [illegible]nt. The greatest antagonism seems to be stirred [illegible] hard saying that the peace which promises best for [illegible] and for mankind would be a peace without a victory. But Mr. Wilson is not the originator of this idea. The questions which he puts have already been raised in all the countries at war. In England they have been stated almost in his own words. Not long ago, a newspaper which has for years been regarded as the most powerful organ of British opinion, outside of London, the *Manchester Guardian*, declared that the great issue before the English Government and the English people was whether the war was to be kept up more for the sake of victory than for the terms of victory. If the terms can be had, substantially, without further fighting, then the going on with hostilities would be a shocking crime. Now, the President clearly avows his belief that satisfactory terms can be had without waiting for an improbable, or, at least, long de[illegible] complete victory. English statesmen have not em[illegible]d more strongly than Mr. Wilson does the safe[illegible]g of small nations and the whole body of humane [illegible] liberal doctrine as applied to the rights of separate peoples. And as a powerful make-weight to their acceptance, the President unfolds his plan of a League of Nations to make the world's peace inviolate, and to bring about the reduction of armies and navies to the mere standard of a necessary police force. An iridescent dream, will exclaim the cynic; not a shred of the practical in it all. On the contrary, disarmament may become one of the most urgently practical questions when the war is over. In all the warring nations they are beginning to ask with anxiety how the enormous interest charges on the war loans can be met. In Germany, for example, those charges are now reckoned at more than the total annual expenditure before the war. Now, if a scheme could be put into operation which would make it safe to dispense with nine-tenths of the appropriations for armaments, and apply the money to the public debt, would any Minister of Finance say that the thing was visionary?

All this is speculative and for the future. What the present holds for us is the act of an American President taking his courage in both hands and uttering a word heard round the world. And that word is for peace, for the free expansion and the friendly intercourse of all the peoples of earth, and for a world-order such as poets have longed for and prophets have proclaimed. No carping can destroy this lofty attitude. And we must not forget that the President's voice will carry to Europe as the voice of the United States, the voice of a mighty nation. It is for this reason that his words will win a hearing, and that his own hope may not be frustrated—a hope expressed in a language and a spirit worthy of Lincoln himself—"I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come already upon the persons and the homes they hold most dear."

Waste Motion at Washington

IT is said of ex-Senator Edmunds that he still reads faithfully every issue of the *Congressional Record*. There could be no better proof of the native vigor of his constitution which has kept him mentally active in a hale old age. No one without great powers of endurance and indomitable purpose could make a habit of following minutely Congressional debates. His temper would break down if his health did not. This would be particularly true at a juncture like the present, when Congress is in arrears with its work, when every member of it is reminded by every other member of the need of making haste and attending strictly to business, yet when the waste of time and words and of human intelligence is more exasperating than ever.

On Tuesday of last week, for example, Senator Overman called up the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill. He thought that it could easily be passed in a couple of hours. But scarcely had the reading of amendments begun when on a single item a debate was precipitated which must have run on for full two hours. It was really a mustard-seed point. But there is nothing which the Senate better loves than to wreak its learning and eloquence upon a mustard seed. The whole question was whether the clerks to Members of the House should be put directly on the pay-roll, or continue to be paid as now by the members who employed them. And it was clearly explained that this amendment had been proposed after consultation with Representatives. Moreover, the bill would go to conference in any case, and if the House objected the matter could be thrown out without difficulty. But there was no damming the Senatorial torrent. Speaker after speaker rose to present views constitutional, views legal, views parliamentary, views moral. Nothing could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stop the inquiries, the objections, the protests, the appeals. When all else failed, some Senator would wander into the Chamber, ask what it was all about, and proceed to add his own contribution of misinformation. In the end, after a perfectly needless and irritating squandering of time, the Senate came round to the view of the Committee and quietly voted to sustain it, 50 to 7.

By this time the Senate was so tired that it allowed several clauses of the bill to be passed without a fight. But before long another matter was brought up which led to speeches, the reading of documents, personal explanations, which were wearisome in the extreme—all the more so because the whole thing was based upon a misunderstanding. What was this vital subject about which mighty Senators wrestled until the going down of the sun? Why, it was the question whether in the Adjutant-General's Office there should be 61 assistant messengers or only 40. The trouble was all made by one of the Senators of longest service, Mr. Gallinger, a Republican who has often railed at Democratic incompetence. He it was who had the amendment made by the Committee. He admitted that he knew nothing about the matter, but some one had told him that there were far too many messengers, and so he had moved to cut off 21 of them. Later, however, he had received a letter from Adjt.-Gen. McCain, who explained that his offices filled 150 rooms in the main building, while he had four branches in various parts of Washington, so that his full quota of messengers was absolutely necessary. Senator Gallinger said that he had no doubt of this, that there was no better or more efficient officer than Gen. McCain, etc., and so the whole matter was dropped. But why was it ever taken up without preliminary inquiry, and why was the Senate compelled to spend a lot of time over what was confessedly a stupid mistake?

The great lack at the Capitol is *motive* for the orderly and prompt dispatch of business. It is nobody's particular concern. The general interest demands that there be a reform of methods, but no individual Senator or Representative feels that he is especially harmed by the slipshod and dawdling ways in vogue. It is not strange that the report on introducing the Taylor system in the Government navy yards and other institutions never got favorable action by Congress. Congress itself feels no spur to efficiency. Why should it be asked to apply one to others? President Taft brought about the appointment of a Bureau of Efficiency and Economy. It has done much good work. It has made several reports on various Circumlocution Offices in Washington, showing how superfluous officials could be spared and obsolete methods freshened. But so far as influencing Congress is concerned, it might as well have sent its communications to the moon.

It will have been noticed that the President has begun going to the Capitol to consult Congressmen about the state of the public business. The object admittedly is to "speed up" the legislative machinery, so as to get at least a part of the Administration's programme through and avoid the need of calling the new Congress in extraordinary session. Yet we do not doubt that these praiseworthy efforts of President Wilson will be denounced by partisans as an attempt to "usurp the powers of Congress." But "power to him who power exerts," says Emerson; and if Congress will not exert its own power, or get up enough energy to make the machine move, somebody has to furnish the driving impulse.

Admiral Dewey

WITH the death of Admiral Dewey there passes, it may virtually be said, the Civil War type of American naval officer. Trained in the school of Farragut, experienced in warfare as a result of the four years of active service in the Rebellion, Dewey was one of the officers who kept themselves professionally alive even during the dull days of wooden ships in the three decades succeeding the surrender of Lee. Modest, unassuming, and gentle of spirit, he was in his person an admirable successor to the men of Farragut's and Porter's generation. These were completely free from the swashbuckling traits one finds to-day in officers who profess to believe that there is no salvation for America save by imitating the worst European follies. It is true that in his later days Admiral Dewey adopted the modern naval cult. But it is profoundly to his credit that during the trying period which followed his astounding victory in Manila Bay he kept his head admirably, displayed excellent judgment, resisted all temptation to pose and rant, and showed a sympathy for the Filipinos and a desire to do them justice which, had McKinley's Administration been similarly actuated, would have prevented the writing of a dark and bloody chapter in our history.

As to the victory in Manila Bay, it was so much exaggerated at the time that when the official facts came out as to the pitiful weakness of the Spanish fleet, there was a corresponding tendency to belittle it. The battle will not, of course, go down to history as a great naval action in itself; it is the consequences—the hoisting of the American flag over the Philippine archipelago, and the disappearance of Spain's colonial empire—that make it a turning point in history. The truth is that Admiral Dewey deserves as much credit as though the odds had been greatly against him. Both his strategy and his tactics were excellent; he acted with dash and daring and with a disregard of torpedoes which would have done credit to his great teacher of 1862. His own personal example was of the best. He was, without being in any way a brilliant man, cool, calm, collected, and determined; certainly his subordinates could not have asked a better commander, and he earned their enthusiastic loyalty.

Moreover, when Admiral Dewey came home to face a hero-worship sufficient to turn the heads of ordinary and many extraordinary mortals, he was not stampeded by it any more than he was embittered by the sudden change in popular favor later. He remained modest and unassuming to the end; he offered no advice to the nation about things as to which he was not particularly competent, and after a brief annoyance by the Presidential bee, he settled down to regular and steady duties at the Navy Department, furnishing in many respects an admirable example to the younger naval generation of what an American naval officer should be.

Admiral Dewey's passing inevitably recalls the excited state of mind in which the nation found itself when the news came that American ships had won a great victory in Asiatic waters, and mastered a great archipelago. Were we to print the extravagant outbursts which appeared then, the visions of a conquered world, of ourselves as the greatest of colonial and Asiatic Powers, of the wealth of the Indies pouring into our lap, of a United States upon which the sun would never again set, they would seem incredibly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fantastic. The delirious passion of the hour subsided quickly enough as the conquest of the Filipinos began; since it became apparent that we could not conquer them spiritually, that they were too different from ourselves to be a properly component part of the American republic. To-day, if there is one thing the American people are *not* interested in, it is our oversea possessions. The poor Porto Ricans knock at our door begging unheard for full citizenship rights, while the Danish West Indian negroes are purchased by us, at a fabulous price per head, without the stirring of the slightest breeze of popular interest.

Indeed, there are few Americans, we believe, who in retrospect would not wish that Admiral Dewey had sailed back to Hongkong as soon as he had broken the Spanish naval power. The illusion of 1898 is gone; what remains is the proud satisfaction that much good has been done to the Filipinos, besides much harm; that our national aims have as yet remained altruistic, despite the defeat of the proposal to write a definite period to the chapter of their tutelage. What people have come to realize is that obtaining empire by cannon-shot is a pretty poor way of doing business; and as they look across the seas and observe the outcome of the latest attempts to impose the wishes of one set of people upon others, they must be convinced that the day will come when the need of military and naval forces shall give way to the establishment of police power.

The Eternal Mid-Victorian

THERE are several ways of explaining the emergence of William De Morgan at the height of the Bernard Shaw era and on the eve of the Bennett and Wells epoch and the younger school of English realists. One way is not to explain, but to take "Joseph Vance" and its successors as one of the anomalies or sports or survivals from which literary evolution is not exempt. Another way is to find in De Morgan's belated Mid-Victorianism a reaction from the new literary manner. Another way is to recall that there is no such thing as a public, but that there are publics. We know that the popularity of Bennett and Wells has not been fatal to the sustained popularity of Hall Caine and Marie Corelli, not to speak of the author of "The Rosary." We know that the vogue of little theatres and Maeterlinck, Synge, Dunsany, Andreyev, Tchekhov has not rendered impossible "Peg o' My Heart," "Daddy Long-Legs," and "Pollyanna." On this basis we might say that De Morgan found his own public lying somewhere between the frankly modern public and the frankly popular public; only that we have every reason to believe that his readers were drawn in very large numbers from the following of Shaw and Bennett and Wells. The most plausible explanation lies in the fact that the new generation was not, and is not, as free from the taint of Mid-Victorianism as it would like to imagine. And we may go a step further and find that the modern writers themselves are not altogether free from the mid-century virus, and that some of their very best work shows when the infection is at its heaviest.

The Mid-Victorian novel is, in form, long and leisurely, and in content sentimental, as we see it to-day. In the matter of form De Morgan was by no means out of touch with modern tendencies. It is possible, in fact, that he may have been a force in shaping contemporary practice. The long novel and the discursive novel is very much with us to-day. The old three-decker dwindles to modest proportions beside the huge bulk of "Jean-Christophe," of "Pelle the Conqueror," of the Clayhanger trilogy, or the sequels and trilogies which the younger men in England nowadays require to trace the career of a single hero from the cradle to the last passionate experience. The point can no doubt be made that whereas the Mid-Victorian novel was garrulous, the modern novel owes its length to fulness of material and a rich detail of treatment. It takes chapters to analyze adequately the subtle modern soul. But this will not altogether explain away "Jean-Christophe," into which the author has frankly poured his personal views and dogmas on a world of modern problems. Romain Rolland editorializes on music, on politics, on international relations, and on sex. Of Wells there is no need to speak. He has been called the most sensitive barometer of the age. But he is also very much the barometer of Mr. Wells's own psychic fluctuations. He is more garrulous than any of the Mid-Victorians. The difference is in the theme of the monologue. And all monologues are rather hard to follow. It is the fashion to say that Thackeray and Dickens make hard reading to-day. It would be interesting to have a frank statement of how easy it is to get through one of Wells's novels with all its divagations, or for that matter a novel by Bennett with all its minute realism.

But the most important thing is not that these men, Rolland, and Bennett, and to a lesser extent Wells, have revived the leisurely method of the Mid-Victorians. It is rather the fact that in order to carry the reader over the long stretch between cover and cover they must resort to the impetus of emotion or sentimentality, call it what you will, upon which the early novelists relied. That is all very fine inlay work, no doubt, by which Bennett depicts the moods of the schoolboy Clayhanger, as he hangs over the parapet of the bridge pitching stones into the water; or young Clayhanger's emotions on coming into possession of a bedroom of his own; or that extraordinary Sunday-school celebration in the public square which runs through several chapters. But let the honest reader compare his own leisurely reactions to such examples of mosaic artistry with the sudden emotional rush that clutches him when Mr. Bennett drops his stitch work and begins to tell the story of Clayhanger's father as a factory boy in the unhappy days of unmitigated Manchestrianism. Those chapters sweep the reader forward on a tide of pity and of indignation that is straight out of Dickens. It is Mid-Victorianism breaking loose from the confines of scientific restraint. Let the reader recall the scene in the death-chamber of Clayhanger's father, or that extraordinary scene of youth and romance and sentiment when Clayhanger meets Hilda in the garden at night. Mr. Saintsbury insists that the prime mission of the novelist is to "enfist" you. Mr. Bennett enfists you when he eschews filigree work and lets himself go on elementals—pity, young love, death. It is the same with "Jean-Christophe in Paris." We are carried away on a current of suffering, pity, self-sacrifice, which is nothing but plain, blubbering Mid-Victorianism. And the only two living characters which Mr. Wells has created are the Dickensian hero of Tono-Bungay and his wife.

The simple fact is that the same people who run to see the ultra-Russians in the theatre as partners in the modern spirit throng to see "Madame X" and "Daddy Long-Legs" as plain human beings. There is an imperishable strain of Mid-Victorianism in the most modern of us.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ulster—An Exposition Based on the Writings of Both Sides*

WHEN world catastrophe enveloped Europe, each nation put local questions aside to confront the issue of its destiny, and such questions now remain half-forgotten, except when some chance recalls them. So, until recently, one scarce remembered that two years ago in July the Irish dispute seemed about to be settled in civil war. In the months before Sarajevo and mobilization, earnest, silent men had procured arms and were drilling in North Ireland, for the defence of their heritage, they said; while the Celtic inhabitants in other parts were organizing to assist in coercion. It is impossible now, as it was then, to determine whether the majority of British people favored Irish Home Rule. Many opposed, and many desired it or were willing that it should be granted; but there is no doubt that, whatever these feelings were, the entire problem was vastly more complicated and far more difficult to solve because of the existence of a particular factor, which was the attitude of the inhabitants of Ulster. It was difficult to grant Ireland a measure of independent nationality, because in the island there existed virtually two different nations.

As danger of separation from England drew near the resistance of the northern province became more passionate and fierce. "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right," Lord Randolph Churchill had said a generation before, and often these words reëchoed. In 1912 a "Solemn League and Covenant" was subscribed to:

> We, whose names are underwritten, men of Ulster, loyal subjects of His Gracious Majesty King George V, humbly relying on the God whom our fathers in days of stress and trial confidently trusted,
>
> Do hereby pledge ourselves in solemn Covenant throughout this our time of threatened calamity to stand by one another in defending for ourselves and our children our cherished position of equal citizenship in the United Kingdom, and in using all means which may be found necessary to defeat the present conspiracy to set up a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland.

The *Covenanter*, a periodical, bore motto from Oliver Cromwell and the figure of one of his Ironsides. Kipling's words were repeated:

> The dark eleventh hour
> Draws on and sees us sold
> To every evil power
> We fought against of old.

"Help me keep the flag!" ran the legend under a picture of Ulster beset; and a gentler appeal displayed one who in yearning affection long ago had said: "Intreat me not to leave thee."

Certain it was that a great number of Irishmen in the northern counties, 800,000 or more, were bitterly opposed to Home Rule, which they believed fraught with degradation and disaster for them. In the eyes of these people the authorities at Westminster had no moral right to subject them to the domination of a government which would surely oppress them; nor had Parliament received from the electors of the United Kingdom any express mandate to pass such a law. Were the people of Ulster, always loyal to the British Government, sincerely attached to it, and fearing to be put outside its protection, were they, then, to be thrust into the power of their enemies? "Will the old lion still sleep and forget its cub?" were the words of a striking cartoon in which a lion stood at bay of a pack of snarling wolves. Was it possible that most of the British people wished this to be done? Let there be no mistake about it: "A vote for the Radicals is vote for bloodshed in Ulster"; "a vote for the Radical means a widow in Ulster." In fulfilment of a political compact, the Liberal party might enact a law of Home Rule; but if so, Ulster would refuse to recognize it, and would resist it with force of arms. In an Irish civil war they might hope to hold their own, since for some years unfortunately they had been compelled to foresee the peril of the future, and their preparations were elaborate and complete. Would England intervene to compel obedience to the statute of the realm? Such attempt might be made; but would the people of England and Scotland allow coercion of kinsmen and brethren in the church, whose greatest fault was attachment to the flag and to the Act of Union? Could any government which undertook it stand before the wrath of constituents? Even this might be; but many believed what Sir Edward Carson said in 1913: "If England . . . allows the army and navy to be used, we may be coerced into submission, but if we are we will be governed as a conquered community and nothing else."

I

The old story of the domination by English conquerors of Celtic inhabitants, the sequestering of their land, and their degradation under long continued persecution and economic serfdom has been often told, and need not be told again, except to say that, while this condition of helotage might without great difficulty have been changed for the better in course of time and as the public conscience of England became humanitarian and enlightened, yet the situation was fatally compromised by the introduction into North Ireland of large numbers of Presbyterian settlers from Scotland and from England, who made the province of Ulster largely their own, gave to it a character and a culture different from that of the other provinces, and in the end by their own efforts developed a prosperity splendid and substantial.

The conquest of Ireland by Englishmen was for a great while halting and incomplete, so that from Henry II to Henry VIII little more than the coast country was held; but during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries land was constantly taken from Irish possessors and given to English holders, until after the period of Cromwell and after the flight of James II and the Treaty of Limerick transference from Celt to Saxon was nearly complete. In most of Ireland property and power had come into the

*In large part this study is based upon the fugitive and controversial literature which was published so profusely in the British Isles during the Home Rule struggle prior to the war. The better leaflets and pamphlets have been used, but they contain much that is exaggerated and partisan, and a great deal that results from religious prejudice and political bias. This account, therefore, is not designed to embody the opinions of the writer, but to detail what men and women in England and Ireland then said and believed, and, above all, what they attempted in the heat of controversy to make those about them believe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands of landlords, resident or absent, beneath whom were a servile peasantry in ignorance, poverty, and subjection. But to this general rule there was one very striking exception. In the days of James I the confiscated lands of Tyrconnel and Tyrone were used to found the plantation of Ulster, to which English and Scottish settlers were brought, and from which the natives were deported, though some remained to work for the new proprietors. Accordingly, as time went on there grew up beside each other in the island two separate entities, almost two separate nationalities; one Celtic, Roman Catholic, politically backward and depressed, ignorant, poor, exploited by an alien aristocracy, with hopeless outlook and fierce hatred for the despoilers; the other Anglo-Saxon and Protestant, large proprietors or substantial farmers and artisans, under British authority ruling or allied with the ruling class, always proud, sometimes prosperous and successful.

There were many vicissitudes and dreadful struggles before all this was confirmed. There were the days of Charles I and his Parliament facing each other for final struggle, when tidings of Irish massacre and insurrection cast drear horror over England; or when James II, outcast, came over from France to lead his Irish subjects, and their enemies were persecuted, deprived of their property, or driven over sea for refuge, and Protestants were hanged from trees in thick clusters. There were the other days when Cromwell arrived with stern and sombre soldiery to slaughter the garrison of Drogheda and hunt the rebels through endless flight in bogs and fens, after which, in the midst of mute despair, there was new security for the aliens. And there were the last hopeless times when James had fled from the Boyne and Limerick had surrendered, when spirited Irishmen went to serve in the army of France, and the country was left prostrate before the stranger. The memory of these events and of the strife in which men had faced each other left a lasting heritage of fear and ill will. All through the eighteenth century the Protestant minority, living mostly in Ulster, retained its supremacy and continued to preserve such scanty prosperity as the exclusive mercantile policy of Great Britain permitted. All through this time the native Irish, the great majority of the population, remained the serfs of their landlords, multiplying their children in hunger, ignorance, and filth, and holding with ever more passionate devotion to their Roman Catholic faith. But in the later years and in the nineteenth century change of spirit in the conduct of public affairs ameliorated the condition of both parties. After the removal of economic restrictions Ulster achieved industrial and commercial prosperity; while for the Celtic inhabitants there were gradually obtained freedom in their worship, participation in political privilege, and, finally, most important of all, assistance for the getting again of the agricultural land which their fathers once had lost. Most of this had not been obtained until the Irish Government had been merged into the British, and until years of pestilence and famine had driven from the island great numbers of the natives to foreign lands, where they held implacable hatred of their oppressors. But usually, both in years of common suffering and in better times, the difference between the two bodies of the people of Ireland remained striking and complete.

So when, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, comparative freedom, better living, and rising spirit of nationality made Irishmen desire the abrogation of the Act of Union and restoration of their own government, it was gradually seen that there were in the narrow compass of the island two groups, in respect of religion, industrial organization, and political outlook, far more different than were the populations to the north and south of the Potomac before 1860, and in spirit sometimes almost as different as the nationalities of Germany and France; and that whereas it was most proper for the Celtic majority to cherish earnest desire for as complete expression of nationality as world affairs rendered feasible, on the other hand, according to advocates and politicians, almost everything that nationalism and prudence could suggest made the Protestant industrial communities in Ulster dread a severance of the ties which bound them to their brethren in Great Britain.

II

Foremost were considerations of religion. In Ireland the religious intolerance and distrust which had characterized Europe in the seventeenth century lingered on as fiercely as in the days of the Thirty Years' War or when the Reverend George Walker led the citizens of Londonderry on through their terrible defence. Nothing could convince a great number of Protestants that Home Rule did not mean "Rome Rule," as they declared it did. Their fears, according to a controversial leaflet of the Ulster Unionist Council, might well be expressed in the passage of Veuillot retold by Lecky:

> "When you are masters," he said to the Liberals and Protestants, "we claim perfect liberty for ourselves, as your principles require it; when we are the masters we refuse it to you, as it is contrary to our principles."

"The history of a thousand years," said another, "has taught us that when the Roman Church can control a government, it employs the government to repress or to crush heretics, and Protestants are the worst of heretics." Ulstermen declared again and again that if their present safeguards were withdrawn the Catholic Church would find means to make its will prevail, and that in the end, under Home Rule, they would have neither justice nor protection. In 1912 a statement issued by a convention held at Belfast said:

> Presbyterians are convinced that the power of the Church of Rome over her members would be used through an Irish Parliament and Executive for the furtherance of the Roman Catholic faith, and to the detriment of the Evangelical churches.

To outsiders such distrust seemed bigotry and intolerance, and rightly, but not to most people in Ulster, nor to some who visited them. According to a writer in the *Daily Mail*, it was grounded upon what Protestants conceived to be the conduct of Catholics themselves: that priests took persistent and extraordinary measures to prevent parishioners from participating in the activities of Protestants; that they would not let them share in charities, nor have workmen's clubs or associations together, nor, above all, common schools, so that in Belfast there had to be even a separate technical institute. "I began," he said, "to see that there was something besides bigotry." It was the opinion of one that the Irish people were the most Catholic in the world.

Irish ecclesiastical organization was especially powerful, it was said. While the population had been declining, the number of the priests had been increasing, until the army of churchmen was out of all proportion to the number of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people, and far in excess of anything prevailing in countries like Austria and Belgium. Undoubtedly, these churchmen would work in politics for the greater glory of their faith. According to an Irish newspaper, Father Doherty told his parishioners during an election contest that any Nationalist voter who supported the Unionist candidate would be a recreant to his country and would be held responsible at the day of judgment; and many similar speeches were made.

It was said that a Roman Catholic government would deliver education entirely to the Church, until it became a monopoly of Jesuits, Christian Brothers, and various teaching orders of Rome. According to a statement issued by the Irish Methodists in 1912:

> With, perhaps, some infinitesimal exceptions, there is not a secondary Roman Catholic school kept by a layman or lay-woman in the British Isles. All are owned by priests, monks, and nuns, and conducted on Jesuit principles.

Always the Catholic hierarchy denounced as godless other teaching than their own, and strictly prohibited Catholic children from being educated with those of the other faith. Already the general tendency of Irish education was slowly but surely towards Catholic methods and ideals; but under Home Rule all would be controlled by the Vatican, Irish primary education would be wholly sectarianized, and provision for Protestant minorities in Nationalist districts hopelessly extinguished all over Ireland. The supremacy of the Church in politics would result also in putting under the control of the Church public institutions like hospitals and workhouses, supported by the state or by public contributions.

Some thought that what might be expected in the general character of Catholic rule was indicated by the operation of the *Ne Temere* decree of 1907. Wide circulation was given to an account of scandal in the case of a Roman Catholic married to a Presbyterian girl in her church and in compliance with every legal formality, who until after the first child was born lived with her happily without any dispute about religion, but who, shortly before the birth of the second, at the instance of the priest, began to doubt the validity of a marriage not performed in the Catholic Church, who some time after, during her brief absence, removed and hid the children, and, when she refused to change her religion, abandoned her altogether. Nor, according to the account given in 1911, did she see her husband or her children again. Other instances were related, and one writer asked:

> When such things are done in broad daylight, under the rule of the Imperial Parliament, what might Irish Protestants expect under a Dublin Parliament controlled and dominated by the Roman Catholic Church?

Fears entertained by these Protestants seemed justified by what they read of affairs in another place where political control had been given to Catholics. "Ulster and Home Rule: A Canadian Parallel, by Mr. Robert Sellar, Quebec, Author of 'The Tragedy of Quebec.'" based upon letters which first appeared in the Belfast *Witness*, was reprinted in various forms and received widest possible circulation; while other writings like it reiterated the lesson. Once Canada had been a Crown Colony, ruled from Downing Street; later Quebec, along with other provinces, received its own Legislature and home rule. Before this was done the Protestant minority in Quebec opposed separation from Ontario, which would leave them at the mercy of a Catholic majority and its priesthood. Thus their position was exactly that of Protestants in the north of Ireland now resisting a similar measure. There the Catholic leaders had denied all desire to interfere with the rights of their brethren, and had willingly consented to embody in the new Constitution guarantees for their protection. That had been forty-five years ago. Let Protestants of Ulster mark well what had followed. First Roman Catholics had become completely masters of the Legislature, then of the courts and the schools. Money voted by the state for education was spent as the bishops ordered; and no bill affecting it could be passed without the sanction of the Archbishop of Quebec. The schools were used to train children in the doctrines and ritual of the papacy, and hundreds of Protestant farmers, isolated among the Catholics, preferred to keep their children away from schools which they were compelled by taxation to support. Meanwhile canon law had become supreme, and everything relating to marriage subordinate to its regulations. Convents and monasteries, supported by the faithful and subsidized by the state, waxed prosperous and multiplied, while the priesthood became ever more powerful and greedy. The cardinal in his palace was the real ruler of the province; and one-seventh of public revenues went to the coffers of the church. Once there had been 17,000 Protestants in the city of Quebec; now there were 4,000. As fast as possible they were leaving the country. Many had gone to the United States; but "the farmers of Ulster would have no like facility to escape the rule of a Dublin Parliament."

How far these fears were groundless or exaggerated or played upon for political purpose, men could not agree. Those who favored Home Rule had no difficulty in collecting numerous liberal statements from Catholics and from Protestants who had no apprehension; while humane and friendly priests were known to many. Catholics, it was said, were broad-minded and fair; bigotry and intolerance were mostly on the other side. Even in Catholic districts Protestants held a disproportionate number of offices. It was said and denied that in Protestant communities Roman Catholics failed of employment. Figures were adduced also to prove that the actual discrimination was not by Catholics against Presbyterians and Methodists, but by Episcopalians, who monopolized the offices, against all others. Some affirmed that it was only by the granting of Home Rule and allowing Ireland to manage her own people that the ascendency of the priests could be broken. "For a time—say, a few years—Protestants might have to suffer some things they would not like, but in the long run it would work out their emancipation." Finally, it was said that religious differences were heightened for a selfish purpose:

> As long as embittered relations could be prolonged between the various denominations, the landlords were able to collect their rents without difficulty; and successive Governments foolishly believed that religious differences made it easier to govern the country. When, however, Self-Government is brought into being, the members of all religious denominations will have something very different to occupy their minds and energies than doctrinal differences.

III

Less fiercely urged, but perhaps more important, were economic and political considerations. Ulster was the commercial and industrial portion of a country otherwise almost entirely agricultural; and it was also a district great-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly and progressively prosperous. While the population of Ireland rose from five millions to eight and declined again to four, Belfast constantly increased its numbers. Now it had some of the most flourishing industries in the world. In 1912 the Belfast *News Letter* published an industrial map of the island to show that Ulster had 35 per cent. of Ireland's population and 35 per cent. of the valuation subject to taxes, that it paid nearly three times as much customs duties as the rest of Ireland, had three-fifths of all Irish export trade, and owned more than three times as much tonnage as all the ports of the remainder of Ireland, that Belfast and the towns near by were thriving industrial centres, that pauperism was lower in the metropolis than elsewhere in the United Kingdom, and that Belfast alone paid one-half of all Irish taxation. Many a flying leaflet told a tale like this. It was the fourth port in the British Isles, and paid twice as much customs revenue as the remainder of Ireland. Its artisans were numerous, sturdy, and well cared for.

In any scheme of things the economic life of Ulster was different from that of the other provinces; its interests were different, and so were its needs. And what would be the situation under Home Rule, with a Parliament at Dublin passing laws for the island and levying the revenues which it deemed proper? Ulster, which paid two-thirds of the taxation of Ireland, had only one-third of its people. Would not the majority in Parliament representing an agricultural constituency poorer than its northern neighbors heap taxes upon their industries? And in this event what redress would there be? Partisan writers stated the case:

> A Home Rule Parliament in Dublin would always be dominated by a majority of at least two to one of members from the other three Provinces, which are mainly agricultural, and whose representatives, in addition to their being almost all Roman Catholics, would also be without any experience of the requirements of a manufacturing community, which Ulster now essentially is, and, of this majority, possibly not more than one or two per cent. would either own or control any industrial concern giving employment to even as many as fifty hands.
>
> Of course the agriculturists in the South and West would naturally like to have all the taxation of Ireland paid by the manufacturing concerns in Ulster, and would, if they had a Dublin Parliament, pretty well see to it that this would be the case.

Such statements were marshalled in a pamphlet, "Ulster's Protest, Her Industrial, Political, Imperial Reasons for Refusing to Submit to Home Rule." "Please read and pass on to a friend," ran the first line on the cover; the price was a penny; 300,000 copies were printed in 1913 and 1914. "Ulster," said the author, "is convinced that under Home Rule her industries would be ruined."

These contentions did not pass unchallenged, and the Home Rule Council, which worked so actively in propaganda favorable to the Nationalists, asserted that, after all, the prosperity of Ulster depended principally on its connections with the rest of the island, and that this was being jeopardized by the agitation and the activity of those who spoke in such fashion.

Finally, as religious dangers, proclaimed so insistently by Ulster, were feared by Protestants elsewhere, so political considerations inspired dread among Unionists everywhere in the island. Home Rule, they said, meant Irish government by notorious political organizations of sinister success and renown, like the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the United Irish League. In such government the methods of the leaders might be as corrupt and malignant as those long seen in cities of the United States where Irish politicians held sway; and the actions of subordinates were already well known in districts of Ireland where boycotting, intimidation, and reign of terror often enforced the will of the masters. If once the protection of British authority were withdrawn, the power of the higher leaders, based upon votes of an ignorant and docile majority, might be consolidated and extended by economic isolation, destruction of property, secret threats, and midnight assassination. And in any event, there would doubtless be discrimination and discriminatory measures in Legislature, in courts, and generally in public life against people of Ulster, Protestants, and whoever opposed the dominant political group.

IV

When the Home Rule bill was passed in successive years by a Liberal House of Commons, and was about to be put beyond the reach of the Lords, as excitement in England took the place of weariness and lethargic contempt, when in Ulster 200,000 men had bound themselves in Solemn League and Covenant against the hated measure, and when 30,000 were drilled and equipped with arms, when in other parts of Ireland Nationalists were preparing to take part in coercion, and when darkening days of despair and disaster seemed at hand, there were some who believed it necessary to recognize the fact that Ireland was, after all, an expression territorial rather than national, a territorial unit embracing two separate nationalities with different aspirations and needs. It was suggested, therefore, that Home Rule should be granted to that part of Ireland which desired it, and that the part which opposed it should be left as before with Great Britain.

This proposal was beset with innumerable difficulties. The situation was not as simple as if it had only involved the relations of one province with the rest of Ireland. It was not merely a Protestant, industrial Ulster comprising one-third of the population, opposed to the wishes of the other two-thirds predominantly agricultural and Roman Catholic. It could never be a case simply of giving Home Rule to Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, with exclusion and the old union for the other province. Ulster itself was divided; only the districts which had once been the plantations contained a decided majority of Unionists and Protestants, while in some of the counties most of the population was Nationalist and Roman Catholic. In 1911 there were about 700,000 Catholics and nearly 900,000 Protestants of various denominations, each of which singly was far outnumbered by the Romanists. Around Londonderry and Belfast were the districts strongly opposed to Home Rule. In five out of the nine counties of the province, it was said, advocates of Home Rule were in the majority, and according to the Home Rule Council, "Tories" elected only a minority of Ulster's representatives in London. But it was answered by the Union Defence League that because of inequalities in representation, a smaller number of Unionists represented a larger number of voters and people.

Accordingly, it was proposed by some to compromise and exclude from the provisions of Home Rule only those counties of Ulster in which the greater part of the people was opposed to it. But again it was said, in all the counties excepting Antrim and Down the populations were so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mixed that there would probably be a desperate struggle between the two parties for the possession of debatable areas. And the exclusion of even so small a part of Ireland from the government to be instituted under Home Rule, since it was so wealthy and important a part, was strongly opposed by Nationalists, who dreaded an Ireland dissevered and incomplete, and who feared the failure of Home Rule if this should be done.

Thus by the summer of 1914 the Irish question, complicated by centuries of oppression and misrule, and of wrongdoing and misunderstanding, seemed near a settlement to be effected by bloodshed and force. There were grim words and steadfast defiance; there were futile attempts at compromise and endless discussion. But, suddenly, as disaster seemed at hand, a mightier evil loomed black on the world's horizon, and, without the omens which warn the masses of mankind, burst like a hurricane. Then, in the midst of appeals for united action to confront the danger without, all parties ceased the debate, and the Irish question, like the feminist movement, was hid for a time by the struggle of nations.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER

The Earth's Threnody

SO long have men beheld
The vile Medusa head of war,
Let them beware
Lest they be turned to stone,
And all the singing lips of poesy be mute.
If these be dumb,
The very stones must cry—
Still more the kindly mother earth,
Whose miserere even now I hear
Beneath the lamentations sore
Of stricken men:

"Oh, God of battles,
Stay the red, red hands of those who slay!
A ghastly load, a mountain load.
They lie upon my breast:
The dead, the dead, the millions dead—
The blasted bloom of all the world.
No more, no more!
I would not take them thus,
So young, clear-eyed, and strong,—
The brave, defrauded dead,
Their joy of life and love forespent—
In winding sheet of frustrate dreams,
With all their visions unfulfilled.

"All unprotesting, I would take the old,
And ease them of their pain,
When Time and Care have drained the wine of life;
Like faded leaves they fall,
Like them to mingle with my mould.
But these—so rudely hurled against my breast,
Were taut to all the pulsing rhythm of life,
And shrinkingly
I feel their fair young bodies lie
Within my cold embrace.
Denied the seemly rites of death and burial
They come; nor shroud or casket
To defer my grievous claim
Till time has made us kin,
And dust to dust is verified.

"All-seeing power above,
Who holdest all the universe
Within thy clasp—
As I the embedded rock,
But give me yet again to know
The calm and peaceful tread
Of gentle men and beasts
That till my fields in quietude.
For like a parent's kind caress
I feel the plough and harrow cleave my sod,
And joyously I take the fallen seed
That I, by heaven's fair miracle,
May feed the sons of men.
But give me yet again
My opaled dew and rain, my unpolluted streams,
Encrimsoned now and curdled thick
From veins of slaughtered men.

"Peace, peace, give peace forevermore!
Then over those asleep
In rude neglected graves,
I'll weave a coverlid of grass and flowers—
And I will bid melodious birds
Above them sing their tenderest songs,
Till all their troubled dreams shall fade
In endless peace."

ELLEN BURNS SHERMAN

French War Rhymes

(After Molière)

MIGUEL ZAMACOÏS, not unknown to the American public, has written for the Paris *Figaro* these seasonable rhymes, Englished here as literally and rhythmically as may be. He calls his interlocutor *"l'Inconscient,"* which signifies one not knowing and not knowing that he knows not and commiserating accordingly, impervious to knowledge or feeling of things as they are. This is the case of the War Critic who pronounces the moment he lands in France, and I have translated so. The other—*"l'Informé"*—is the Well Informed, all the time on the spot. To Pacifists, pitying the French and Belgian people who, as Madame Carton de Wiart has just protested, "ask not pity but justice," this dialogue is addressed—*De te fabula narratur.*—STODDARD DEWEY.]

War Critic:
Good day, Sir. Here in France I land to-day.
What have you done, all the time I'm away?
My ignorance—for I know nothing—aid.
At front, at rear, are you still unafraid?
Many dissatisfied? many protesting now?
How go civilians? and the soldiers, how?
Well Informed:
The trial time of soldiers comes again
With mud and rain—the winter's ghastly train.
War Critic:
And the civilian?
Well Informed:
Oh, he'll have a store
Of coal, I think, but he must pay out more.
War Critic:
Poor man!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Well Informed:
To soldiers, guilty tradesmen sell
At the top price all they need to be well:
No one can fend from them fierce lucre's feet.
War Critic:
And the civilian?
Well Informed:
Oh, he has to eat
Two lumps of sugar in his café-au-lait,
But has none to his dog to throw away.
War Critic:
Poor man!
Well Informed:
When night comes at their vanguard post
Along the line which the enemy bombards most,
Soldiers resist their nature's need to sleep
With ears on watch till the sun begins to peep.
War Critic:
And the civilian?
Well Informed:
Oh, street lamps being out,
On foot to night resorts he goes about
And finds no cabs even though he call aloud—
Or else into the subway he must crowd.
War Critic:
Poor man!
Well Informed:
The soldier takes his cruel fate,
Ready for this third year since the opening date
Of war—he's ardent still, heroic, full of fight.
War Critic:
And the civilian?
Well Informed:
Oh, he pays every night
On restaurant bills and such ten per cent. more;
After six, too, shops shut to him their door.
War Critic:
Poor man!

Correspondence

AMERICA AND THE END OF THE WAR

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: If the President is sincere in his wish to see the war ended, he should first of all recognize the fact that Germany is now exhausted, and can only prolong the war by the use of illegal means—such means as have been condemned by all modern civilized people and all recognized authorities on international law. The use of these illegal means could most easily be stopped, if America took the lead in the formation of a neutral league for the suppression of piracy and the enslavement and wrong treatment of the inhabitants of the countries occupied by the Germans. All that would be necessary would be a simple declaration that all neutral losses and means of obtaining compensation for the same should be *pooled;* for every ton of shipping illegally sunk equal tonnage should be taken from the German shipping in any of the neutral ports; the values of all cargoes destroyed should be summarily recovered from German banks, businesses, or individuals in the neutral countries; all illegal requisitions of money by the Germans should be treated in the same way, and for every Belgian or other civilian deported or enslaved by the Germans, one of their own prominent citizens in any one of the neutral countries should be immediately interned, and thus held as a hostage. Compensation need not necessarily take place in the country sustaining the loss, but should be effected in any one of the neutral countries most convenient on demand from the country sustaining the loss. The neutral countries are too widely separated to make armed intervention perhaps desirable or possible, but the serious threat of the above-mentioned proceedings would force the Germans to rely on fair fighting only, and would be of inestimable value to all the neutrals. America by taking the lead in the matter and by inaugurating the league would bring the war to a speedy termination and earn the eternal gratitude of the civilized world.

J. H. Stonehouse

Muswell Hill, London, January 3

ANOTHER INDIGNATION MEETING

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the notice in your issue of last week, speaking of meetings which had been held in various cities to protest against the Belgian deportations, you do not mention the meeting at Cincinnati, held on the 5th, which was noteworthy, not only because of its size and enthusiasm, but also because of the effort of hyphenates to thwart its purpose—an effort rendered unsuccessful by the sympathy of a great majority of the audience and by the aid of the police, who were obliged to eject the worst of the disturbers.

Charles B. Wilby

Cincinnati, January 15

THE SOUTHERN VIEW OF LYNCHING

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am glad that during the necessary delay in finding space for my rejoinder to Professor Brooks the *Nation* has been able to give us Professor Kesler's welcome news of a widespread resentment against lynching in the city of Waco. For every protest of this kind we are all thankful, and no one can have the least desire to minimize the credit of the men who offer it. That they do so at some personal risk—if we may judge from the brutal measures adopted not long ago towards a courageous sheriff—makes their action all the more deserving of publicity. May such efforts be multiplied and intensified a hundredfold!

But I feel that I must trouble you with some comments upon Professor Brooks's reply to my article. It contains much that I am sincerely glad to have elicited from so authoritative a quarter. He has repudiated that special defence of atrocities against the negro which has been so long and so often repeated, and whose dishonesty it was a chief purpose of my paper to expose. He has spoken in ringing tones against mob law, and I trust he is justified in regarding his own view as characteristic of educated opinion in the South. Best of all, he has given us some tangible evidence of a movement even in Georgia towards removing what he fitly calls "the stigma" from that State. But for the main tenor of my article, by which I regret to see that Professor Brooks has felt offended, I cannot admit any penitence whatever. Let me press upon him the following considerations:

(a) Nothing that I said supports his criticism that I have traduced the attitude of "educated persons" in the lynching areas. It may be that this element, always a small minority in any population—and of course specially small in a State where illiteracy is a crying evil—is as much in earnest on the matter as Professor Brooks has represented. Professor Kesler has shown that, so far as Waco is concerned, there is a far sounder sentiment

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among such persons than the distant observer had been allowed to know. But I fear that the public of which Professor Brooks has spoken must be singularly intractable towards its "intellectual leaders." If "editors, preachers, lawyers, teachers, indeed, all the professional classes, and all business men of consequence" are as genuinely indignant as your correspondent supposes, the influence of these persons must be painfully small. And unfortunately it is the common man who counts. It is he who determines the selection of a Governor. It is he whose pressure upon the Administration decides whether or not the majesty of law shall be protected. It is he who pours petroleum upon the body of an unpopular negro. And the whole point of my contention was that the common man of Georgia or Texas has a very different feeling towards the lyncher from that of common men elsewhere. Professor Brooks has even imparted further emphasis to what I have said, for according to him the ferocity of a mob in these States is such as to defy successfully the vehement condemnation of the entire better class. I submit that we have here something of an enigma. When a law is habitually outraged with impunity one draws an inference as to the feeling of that section of the public which is politically influential. If my little group of talkers in the railway car or the hotel lounge typifies a wide area of the citizenship, the riddle for me is solved. How, may I ask, does Professor Brooks solve it?

(b) I am accused of "a libel on the intelligence of Southern people," because I spoke of them as "pretending" that this impulse comes solely from indignation against sexual crime. Your readers, I am sure, have listened as often as I have to talk about "that nameless terror by which every white woman is haunted in the South." In my experience of discussions on the subject with Southerners, some of whom certainly belonged to the educated class, this has invariably been the *pièce de résistance* of their argument. So far from the *Nation's* readers being composed exclusively of those who "need no call to repentance" on the question, some of the pro-lynching apologists are among the contributors to the *Nation's* correspondence columns. I refer Professor Brooks to the letter from a gentleman in Texas which appeared in the issue of June 22 last. And if he will look at the issues for July 6 and July 13, he will see how generally it has been assumed in the *Nation's* correspondence—except by writers who take a view identical with my own—that rape is the single crime which lynching has to avenge.

Nor do I see how the charge of putting forward this as a *pretence* can have libelled the Southerner's intelligence. It may, no doubt, have reflected upon his honesty. But as a ruse of debate the pretence has a dialectic value. The pro-lyncher does well to rest his case here, for if anything could reconcile a civilized man to mob atrocity it would be the unique repulsiveness of such an offence as that described in the letter of Mr. J. T. Winston. Despite what your correspondent has said, I still believe that a widespread notion of defending female virtue by this means has been a sort of quasi-conscience to many of the Southern public, who have looked on in an otherwise inexplicable apathy. But suppose that Professor Brooks is right. Suppose he is speaking for Georgia as a whole when he says: "We know and admit that rape is rarely the cause of lynching. We have long since progressed beyond the original excuse. Lynching may occur on any occasion in which a negro attacks the honor, life, property, or pride of a white person." An attack, forsooth, upon the *pride* of a white person! By giving evidence against him in a law court? Or by declining to give evidence for him? Or by charging him with graft? Does the Georgia public really tolerate these, deliberately and knowingly, as legitimate provocatives to an *auto da fé?* I protest that Professor Brooks has rescued their intelligence at a high cost. It is not I who have libelled them.

(c) Your correspondent complains that I have not proposed any practical steps by which lynching might be suppressed. It is hardly the function of an outsider, still less of one who is not an American citizen, to devise such ways and means. But when I read of impatience towards "mere denunciation and abuse" I must point out to Professor Brooks that impatience is at least equally in place towards long-continued administrative failure. The guides of public opinion in a Southern State are not surely reduced to stretching forth helpless hands towards others, imploring some one to offer a hint or a suggestion by which their treatment of crime may cease to be a byword among mankind. A more numerous and more effective police, less vacillation and tomfoolery in courts of law, if need be a compulsory redistribution of the black race, above all, a demand for Rhadamanthine justice upon the next lynching outrage—these are points which will occur to every one. But I have not the least doubt that each of them, and every other which might be suggested, would be at once shown by some pro-lynching enthusiast to be "impracticable in the local circumstances." The problem reduces itself to this: Given a self-governing State, where public sentiment on one special field is debased to the core, by what expedient shall even-handed justice in that field be secured? I admit that the answer is beyond me. The circumstances which preclude solution are precisely those without which the problem would not exist.

To those, however, who, like Professor Brooks, fairly acknowledge and sincerely deplore the situation, I would propose this: Let no resentment or sensitiveness towards "criticism" make them ready to palliate the magnitude of the crimes which the critic has attacked. No good is done by citing analogies to prove that they are no worse than crimes elsewhere. The lynching party is only reinforced by hearing a catalogue of the sins of New York or Chicago, with a multiplication of strong adjectives to make these appear equally heinous with burnings at the stake. If the North has its thugs and assassins, its sweated labor and its white slavery, every honest Northerner will welcome the most scathing attack which your correspondent is able to justify by facts and figures. How far the apache of Chicago has taken from the lyncher his famous motto, "The revolver is the law," is a subject which I have seen discussed in an ethical journal by one of Professor Brooks's compatriots. But this is no time or subject for mutual recrimination. The main thesis of my article remains unshaken, that the kernel of the lynching problem lies in the indulgent or approving attitude towards such crime of that section of the public which can see that its will is not balked, and in either the reluctance or the inability of the better type of Southern citizen to make his voice effectual. Small comfort is to be had from the assurance that the intellectual *élite* are reformers, until their zeal begins to show itself in deeds.

HERBERT L. STEWART

Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, January 15

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Problems of Immigration

The Tide of Immigration. By Frank Julian Warne, Special Expert on Foreign-born Population, United States Government, Thirteenth Census, Former Secretary, New York State Commission of Immigration. New York: D. Appleton & Co. $2.50 net.

TO estimate fairly the weight of Mr. Warne's arguments, one must not forget that they have been written under the influence of a strong preconception that immigration into the United States should be heavily reduced, and that the literacy test so persistently urged during recent years should be the instrument of reduction. The validity of an argument is of course not disproved by showing that it is brought to the support of a preconceived idea. So long as human nature remains human, however, the preconceived conclusion will continue to lay for our reasoning faculties pitfalls which only the most incessant care and conscience can avoid. We must ask, therefore, of a book such as this, what are the author's preconceptions and how far, if at all, have they misled him in his conclusions?

Mr. Warne desires a radical reduction in the amount of immigration and insists that the literacy test should be the means of this reduction. But he is frank to say that he picks upon this test not because the illiterate immigrant is *per se* undesirable, but because it is a test that will exclude a larger number than any other which seems available. He is willing to admit that such a test will operate in a wholesale way to exclude industrious men and women of unquestionable moral character, while leaving the door open to many who are extremely undesirable on moral grounds. The fundamental moral objection to a test which cuts so ruthlessly across all lines of ethical, and even economical, desirability and undesirability he does not seem capable of appreciating. To his mind, the one fact that it will exclude large numbers is its sufficient justification.

When it comes to the question of a reason for desiring the exclusion of large numbers, we find Mr. Warne repeatedly talking the language, sometimes quoting the very words, of a class of labor agitators who bring to the problem of immigation the narrowest and most rabid conceptions. As the tariff-protected manufacturers see nothing in international trade except a possible influence to reduce the price of the specific article which they have to sell, so the opponents of immigration see nothing in the incoming European but a possible competitor for a job held by some one already here. It is conceivable that international trade, by finding for the surplus of easily produced articles in one country a welcome market in others, tends to the increased comfort, greater happiness, and enhanced prosperity of all, decreasing poverty and hence increasing consumption of home products, as well as those imported from other lands. But the tariff-bleared eye never gets itself focussed on that possibility. It is conceivable also that an essentially free passage from each country to others of able-bodied and law-abiding workers, whether skilled or unskilled, laborers with the hand or with the mind, would tend to produce a more healthful equilibrium of the same nature in the labor market, stimulating increased comfort, greater happiness, and enhanced prosperity for all, and thus in the long run improving the material condition of the laborer already in any given country as well as that of the immigrant. But to the existence of such a possibility one finds not a scrap of evidence in this volume. The author gives no adequate consideration to the patent fact that many immigrants who entered as laborers but yesterday are to-day prosperous employers of labor, developing industries which in the aggregate require workmen by the scores of thousands, living in fine houses which have to be built and plumbed and painted and plastered, and consuming liberally the products of American wheat fields, orchards, and dairies. No, the prospective American who is to land from to-morrow's vessel, if not headed off in the meantime, is to him only an unwelcome competitor for the job of the American of to-day, ready to take and hold that job at a lower wage and thus precipitate a tumble in "the American standard of living" to the level of the less prosperous countries of the old world. And how easily he imagines that this effect can be produced! "All that a manager or a foreman of a mine, mill, or factory needs in order to make effective the lower wage scale is not as large a number of immigrants as he has workers, but just enough of those willing to work for the low wages to enable him to threaten the native employee with the loss of his job. Thus a foreman or boss can in divers ways effectively use one immigrant against fifty or one hundred employees. In consequence a small number of immigrants working for a low wage sets the rate of pay and determines the conditions of employment for a much larger number of workers." Even to a theoretical "labor expert," sitting in his study and digging out his conclusions with the old-fashioned *à priori* hoe, it might occur as a possibility that a large share of these immigrants would have some hankering after the higher American wage and its more comfortable standard of living, and would not so readily and inevitably second the machinations of the boss to bring down the wage and the standard of living to the painful old-world level from which they had fled. But when a man can write such a paragraph as we have quoted after years of actual experience, after reading the American papers and coming into actual contact with American labor organizations, strikes, etc., one hardly knows what to say. The temptation is simply to drop his arguments as having no real relation to actual conditions, and to turn the attention elsewhere. But they have at least this relation to actual conditions, that they are written with a certain air of finality which, so far as conclusions are concerned, may easily carry conviction to readers who run over the text too carelessly to note the weakness of the premises and the gaps in the logic. That the immigrant laborer is not as a rule content to work for the mere cost of existence, on a pitifully low standard, is proved by necessary implication in the author's own assertion that the class to which he belongs is sending back to Europe every year several hundred million dollars of surplus earnings. The amount is probably exaggerated, but it is large enough legitimately to have caused him to question some of his conclusions, had he been on his guard. As to the "standard of living," the influence of the European-American citizens, after they have been here long enough to get their bearings, is not always in the downward direction. Many of them set examples of lavish extravagance rather than harmful under-living. Others give lessons of careful economy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wholly commendable, showing themselves able to educate their children and pay for their own homes with a success which some classes of native-born Americans would do well to emulate. In short, our immigrants are human and hence varied in their characteristics, just as those of us who came over the same ocean in the persons of our ancestors a few generations ago, and thus acquired the distinction of native birth, are human and hence varied. To lump them all together and assume that the year's intake at our eastern harbors is essentially only a heavy downward weight upon our wages and standards of living should satisfy no open-minded student of American history.

Naturally, one finds Mr. Warne's mind wholly skeptical as to the sincerity of the altruistic motive in any who oppose the literacy test on the ground that it is at variance with the fine tradition handed down to us by our ancestors. In his opinion our attitude in such matters is and should be determined by motives of mere self-interest—a selfishness enlightened, if you please, but selfishness none the less. We are not so ready to believe that there is not in the average American citizen of good intentions the capacity to be influenced by altruistic motives, even against the dictates of self-interest; neither are we ready to define "self-interest" so narrowly as to assume that it requires us harshly to throw a bar across the path of thousands of industrious men and women who aspire to tread the way of modern progress with us, simply because the harder conditions to which they were born have forbidden them the boon of literacy. A broad and generous view of the whole field may lead one to the conclusion that the temporary infelicities and hardships of adjustment and assimilation involved in our immigration problem will in the long run be compensated for, even on the basis of a duly enlightened self-interest.

If all immigration is *ipso facto* undesirable, we could exclude it all with better grace than to exclude a large part under a test so crude and so morally indefensible. But no one pretends that all immigration is undesirable. We should continue, then, in the attempt to exclude such classes as are essentially undesirable under standards which fairly separate them from the number of those who are actuated by worthy motives and whose satisfactory assimilation (satisfactory to themselves as well as to us) is not rendered wholly improbable by discoverable moral, mental, or physical defects. That such standards, carefully enacted into law and fairly executed, would exclude a far larger number than are barred at present is hardly to be gainsaid. But such legislation and its faithful execution are advisable not because the resultant exclusion would be larger, but because it would be the exclusion of essentially undesirable elements, undesirable even if the total coming in was so small as to be wholly inconsiderable from Mr. Warne's special point of view.

There were good grounds, even before the war, for predicting an early decrease in the amount of European immigration. In respect of some of the countries from which we have had large numbers in the past, a substantial equilibrium had already been reached and the inflowing current had virtually ceased. That a similar equilibrium will be reached at no far distant date with still other immigrating populations can safely be predicted on the basis of the very grounds by which Mr. Warne himself accounts for immigration. Though the termination of the war will of course be marked by a resumption of the inflow in some measure, the reasonable probabilities are that it will be a less, not a greater, measure than before. We are living in the twentieth century, not the tenth, and Europe is not going to sink into hopeless lethargy after this hurricane of war is over. Under modern methods, led by men of the highest scientific training, she will be rapidly rebuilt and rejuvenated, and the depleted ranks of her laborers will be needed in the process. Her workmen will be freer than before, more able to influence governmental action, and thus to better their condition without leaving the lands of their birth, for which we have surely had ample reason of late to learn that they do hold a warm affection. Under such circumstances, we are in no need of rushing into crude and ungenerous restriction through fear of sudden ruin bursting upon us by way of Ellis Island.

Treitschke's Theory of the State

Politics. By Heinrich von Treitschke. Translated from the German by Blanche Dugdale and Torben de Bille. With an Introduction by the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour and a Foreword by A. Lawrence Lowell. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co. $7.

BEYOND the fact that von Treitschke was a German university professor who had succeeded, by some curious process, in instilling into the minds of his countrymen a peculiarly brutal and offensive theory of politics and government, few, we imagine, of those among us who of late have so often spoken his name would have been able to affirm anything very definite about the man or his work. One must know German extremely well to read any of his writings with ease; and the temper of the age, especially in the United States, has not been altogether favorable to the reading of long and serious works of any sort. The appearance of this excellent translation of the "Politics," however, makes it possible for those who cannot use German to learn at first-hand the nature of von Treitschke's teachings, and to judge for themselves how far those teachings, taken as a whole, accord either with the policy of Germany at the present time or with the policy which Germany or any other country ought to pursue at any time.

We say ought to pursue rather than may pursue because there is in von Treitschke's theory of the state an explicit as well as an implicit recognition of divine will and purpose. The state, he affirms, is power. From the standpoint of its subjects, as well as from the standpoint of other states, it is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. Whatever the people may think about it at the moment, the state will, because it must, have its way. It is by the strong right arm of its power that the state maintains its dignity, independence, and solidarity, forces recognition from other states, wrests from its rivals the coveted place in the sun. But it does all this, not for selfish gratification, nor yet because of any fatalistic impulsion, but because it is enacting the very will of God. The divine intelligence which sees the end from the beginning, and orders all things for the attainment of its purposes, has willed the state as the supreme embodiment, in social relations, of power. Hence it is that the state, instead of being a voluntary affair, is not only embedded in the nature of things, but is also the imposing embodiment of a supreme social morality. Whether we have a Kepler studying the stars through a telescope, or a von Treitschke scanning the operations of government

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through history and philosophy, there is the same essential reverence of attitude. Each thinks the thoughts of God after Him.

The practical conclusions and moral precepts which von Treitschke draws from his study of this interesting structure of divine plan and inherent necessity, while sometimes startling if taken by themselves, are, from his point of view, both logical and obvious. The worst offence, for example, of which a state can be guilty is to fail to maintain and extend its power; and since the readiest means to such maintenance and extension is war, the state will not hesitate for an instant to go to war when its rights are assailed, and it will keep its army, and its whole social organization as well, in constant readiness for war. With supreme contempt von Treitschke sweeps aside every aspiration for peace, whether national or international, and not only champions war as the highest assertion of political morality, but insists that war must continue, and ought to continue, to the end of time, if the state itself is to endure. Further, since the state is power, the greater the power the better the state. Small states, accordingly, are always more or less contemptible, and must in due course disappear, not, again, for the mere selfish aggrandizement of the larger and truer states, but for their own good and the good of the world. And with power comes culture—that broad and generous intellectual interest, that keen appreciation of ethical values, that conscious and happy pursuit of the ideal in every social relation, which von Treitschke would have us believe Germany, of all the nations that have ever been, most perfectly illustrates. As to the structure of society, it is essentially aristocratic. The worker must work that the ruler may rule, and divine omniscience assigns to each his place. Incidentally, the author abhors the "monstrous regimen of women," denies the worthfulness of woman's contribution to literature or art, deprecates her irruption into industry while admitting its limited necessity, and fixes her confines primarily at the home.

It would be a thankless task to list the numerous errors of historical statement which stud the pages of this extraordinary book, and which do little credit to von Treitschke's methods as a scholar. Some of the more glaring misstatements, especially in regard to England, and some of the equally glaring errors of logic, have been deftly punctured by Mr. Balfour, whose introduction to the present translation, while naturally hostile, is a model of graceful skill. Nor can it be worth while, we think, to spend much time in refuting the theory which these thousand pages of undeniably brilliant writing expound and enforce. One who assumes, however, to interpret the will of God to men, if so be it that he speaks not by inspiration, must put in evidence not merely his accuracy as to facts, but as well his sense of proportion and his breadth of view. That the state must possess the power necessary to preserve its existence and enforce obedience to its will; that the individual must, in general, subordinate his personal notions in political matters to the decisions of the state; that small states often exist by sufferance, and that some ought not to have attempted to exist at all; that men and women fall naturally into classes, or that the recognition of peace as an effectual substitute for war is still a dream, no sensible or informed student of history or politics, so far as we know, has ever denied. The fundamental vice of von Treitschke's theory of the state is that he selects from the experience of the past those incidents, obviously extremely numerous, which are primarily illustrative of the workings of power, and erects upon them, and upon them alone, a theory of political conduct couched in terms of universal imperative. The strong state, seizing, consolidating, and maintaining its power by force, and moulding the thought of its people, by its record of quantitative achievement, into acceptance of a social ideal which is, after all, only a vision of material conquest, has seemed to him good, and he has called it God; and since, for the masses at least, God must in some way be visualized, he summons his countrymen to bow, sword in hand, before the stained and cracked mirror of what he is pleased to call history, and worship themselves.

Clearly, in this superficial world which von Treitschke sees and whose cruder operations he expounds and justifies with the zest and frankness of a Machiavelli there is no room for anything save force. All the finer impulses of intellectual speculation or moral aspiration which cross, with their strong white light, the darker field of history are to him negligible quantities. In spite of his sneers at an America of whose history and spirit these pages display abysmal ignorance, von Treitschke would have at least agreed with John J. Ingalls that the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule have no place in practical politics. It is needless to say that we do not so interpret history. Above the nation, said Goethe, is humanity; and there is weighty authority for affirming that it is man rather than the state that was made in the image of God. With fullest recognition of the indispensableness of force, and with all respect for the state as an embodiment of power, one yet must needs read history over again if one has failed to perceive that moral and spiritual forces, the free range of mind in the endless areas of fact, the struggles of men for a better life than the state had thus far afforded them, the vision of the day when the dictates of conscience should replace the law of the jungle, have forever been curbing and directing the power of the state. The Machiavellian postulate of a public morality essentially different from private morality, which von Treitschke accepts with little more than a semblance of qualification, is, unhappily, a generalization only too well grounded in experience; but it is as valueless as a precept as a statistical record of crime would be in sustaining the proposition that a certain number of us ought to steal. There have been righteous wars, and so long as nationality endures righteous wars there will be; yet in the long course of history it is war, and not peace, that is the incident. One cannot but wonder whether von Treitschke himself, could he but see to-day the Europe which, in so many ways, illustrates his theory of the state, would still look upon the awful spectacle of embodied power which it presents, and say Amen.

Current Fiction

The Emperor of Portugallia. From the Swedish of Selma Lagerlöf. By Velma Swanston Howard. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.

THIS has the peculiarly clear, child-hearted quality which has endeared the writer's work to a continually increasing number of readers. The theme is not altogether "pleasant," from the sewing-circle point of view. There is always, indeed, a certain poignancy about Miss Lagerlöf's sweetness which distinguishes it from mere sentimen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tality. The central figure here, Jan of Ruffluck, is, in a sense, a dull boor. Until the birth of his daughter he has had nothing to rouse him from his sluggish acceptance of life as something to be endured. His marriage itself has fallen about: it means nothing but an arrangement which has turned out inconveniently enough. He has no desire of fatherhood. But the moment when he first holds his child in his arms, his heart begins to beat, he becomes alive and happy. From that moment he lives for her and through her. She comes to the verge of womanhood in safety, loving Jan almost as he loves her. But fortune steps between them. An unjust man threatens to rob them of their home. To save it Glory Goldie, as the simple father has named her, must go into service in the far city. She goes, and at the due hour sends back the necessary money. But she has gone the dingy way for it. The father waits and hopes for her return; but at last rumor clinches his own misgivings; his mind gives way. He begins to fancy strange things, chief among them that Glory Goldie is now a great lady, Empress of Portugallia, destined soon to return in all her splendor. And by a twist of imagination he himself becomes Emperor of Portugallia, tricking himself in strange finery, and boasting to all hearers of his daughter and their possessions. Meanwhile the wife, who has cared little for him in his sanity, shows her devoted heart. Finally Glory Goldie returns—her glory sadly dimmed. She is prosperous, and has planned to make a home for her parents in the city. But she is repelled by her father's madness and plans to elude him and leave him. As the direct result of this perfidy Jan is drowned. And after his death, for the first time, he takes possession of his daughter. She sees him, at last, not as the rough old hind, or the demented boaster, but as one who has broken his heart for her. And somehow the bond between them is renewed: "Then she knew that all was well again between her father and her; that he and she were one, as in the old days. Now that she loved him, there was nothing to be atoned."

The Lion's Share. By Arnold Bennett. New York: George H. Doran Co.

THIS is in what may be called Mr. Bennett's intermediate manner. It lies between the engaging extravagance of "Buried Alive" and the determined jog-trot of "Clayhanger." It is an amusing entertainment, with touches of seriousness—or, let us say, of deeper humor. On the surface, is the story of a maiden named Audrey who has grown up under the full bondage of that middle-class provincialism which is the curse, and the making, of modern heroines. Finding herself suddenly an heiress and unattached, she determines to have her fling at the world. For perfect freedom she adopts widowhood and a fresh name, and with a delightful and eccentric spinster for companion sallies forth upon her adventures. These presently bring her to Paris and a mild Bohemia, where she encounters two interests, feminism and love. She gives her intellectual allegiance to the former—or rather (since intellectual is a strong word for pretty Audrey) she yields to it in theory. She intends to have the lion's share of life, the thing best worth having, and for a time permits herself to be persuaded that the good of her sex, the sacred Cause, is that thing. She even takes part in a militant exploit, and narrowly escapes arrest. But something in her refuses to be committed; not even the great leader of the suffrage cause in England can win from her a complete dedication of her future.

The truth is, her lion's share, her real happiness and fulfilment, lie in a very different direction. Clever Madame Piriac sums it all up, when Audrey asks her if she sympathizes with suffragism: It might as well be a question, she says, of sympathizing with an earthquake; what does it matter? Feminism was bound to come, the vote is bound to be yielded to women, sooner or later. But it isn't necessary for every woman to give her life to hurrying the process. Women are the great conservatives: "All the beautiful and luxurious things in the world are in the custody of women." Most women also are individualists, they become complete only by giving themselves to some other self. . . . Audrey does not relish this, it does not fit her theory, but it is presently to prove its truth as far as her nature and practice are concerned. Already, indeed, in the person of young Musa, the violinist, she has met and secretly owned her mate. He needs her, is one of the childishly exacting and dependent men, and her feeling is half-maternal, that is to say, the true wife-feeling. So Audrey finds her solution: it is not represented as a solution for every woman. Rosamund, the tireless and devoted general of the militant hosts of England, had also found her right road if not the right means for self-fulfilment. Not the least delightful figure in the story is the ardent, vague, adventurous but discreet Miss Ingate.

Polar Exploration

With Scott: The Silver Lining. By Griffith Taylor. Illustrations and maps. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. $5 net.

The Last Voyage of the Karluk. By Robert A. Bartlett and R. T. Hale. New York: Small, Maynard & Co. $2.50 net.

WHILE Capt. Robert Falcon Scott was passing the winter at Cape Evans, preparing for his successful and fatal dash for the Pole, he entered in his diary a revised estimate of the men whom he had chosen as helpers. Of the author of the volume now before us he wrote, "Taylor's intellect is omnivorous and versatile. His mind is unceasingly active, his grasp wide. Whatever he writes will be of interest. His pen flows well." The estimate was just. A ready pen and the wide grasp of an active and versatile mind are evident in every part of the narrative which Mr. Taylor has now presented. The work is of deep interest, though no collateral publication concerning this expedition can ever approximate the tragic interest of Scott's own diary, leading up to its catastrophe with the gloomy inevitability of a drama of Æschylus or Sophocles. In a brief introduction to this volume Mr. Leonard Huxley tells us that he has often liked to think "that the universal thrill awakened by Scott's example strung up the soul of the nation unawares for the great call so soon to be made upon it," referring, of course, to the present war.

Mr. Taylor has justifiably tried to make of his chapters a sort of relief from this tragedy, bringing the mind back, after grief has had its appropriate season, to the pleasanter phases of companionship developed on the desolate stretches of antarctic ice. A great deal of attention is given to the reading of the various members of the party, the course of scientific lectures delivered, the indoor and outdoor games, the jest and repartee of daily conversation by which the inevitable monotony of the life was broken.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For with all its uncertainties, its lurking tragedies at every turn, it is in its general character a terribly monotonous life after all. And if one finds variety in the many bulky volumes of polar literature that have fallen from the press during the past decade, it is rather in the reaction of that monotony upon individuals of varying personality than in any essential variety in the groundwork of their stories. We have already indicated that Mr. Taylor had a personality of sufficient distinction to give his narrative a strong individual flavor. This could readily be illustrated by quotation, but space will not permit. The ground covered by the volume is first a western journey for the study of the geology of the glacier region on the west of MacMurdo Sound, with Mr. Taylor in charge of the exploring party; then a month at "Discovery Hut," where the reader of Scott's own diary will remember that the gloom of coming disaster began very distinctly to gather; then seven months in winter quarters with Capt. Scott at Cape Evans, and finally a second western expedition, for the study of the region of Granite Harbor. This expedition covered the period of Scott's polar dash, with its keen disappointment of the discovery that Amundsen had been first, and its tragic ending on the Ross Barrier a few weeks later. Mr. Taylor is of the opinion that Scott would have won his way to safety but for the illness of Seaman Evans. The difficulty and delay of caring for him, together with the unusually violent weather, hopelessly exhausted the strength of the party. After the death of Evans it became more and more a race with famine, and when Oates fell sick the last chance was gone. Even if the three still remaining had reached One Ton Depot, so near at hand when Scott's last pathetic "Message to the Public" was written, Mr. Taylor does not think that the result would have been changed. There was no opportunity for thorough rest there, and there was no strength left for the ten remaining days necessary to reach Discovery Hut. "Their journey was a supreme struggle against all the powers of Nature, and when all human effort had been expended, they succumbed, winning a deathless renown which has aroused the envy of all brave men and the admiration of the world."

"The Last Voyage of the Karluk" is Capt. Bartlett's account of the fate which overtook the vessel in which Stefansson left Nome for the Arctic seas, during the summer of 1913. In a month's time the Karluk had rounded Point Barrow and made something more than half the distance from there to Herschel Island, where it was the intention to spend the winter. Here, however, the ship was frozen into the ice jam, and it soon became evident that the goal could not be reached. Towards the end of September, Stefansson deemed it expedient to make a ten days' expedition to the shore, with five companions and appropriate sledge equipment, leaving Capt. Bartlett in command. Before he could return, however, the ice began a steady drift to the westward and all trace of the Karluk was lost. Word of her disappearance reached the outside world some weeks later, and for a long time it was supposed that she had been lost, with all on board. Her fortunes and those of her crew, after the separation from Stefansson, form the theme of Capt. Bartlett's story.

The Karluk was not a wise choice, since she had not been constructed to withstand the pressure of heavy ice, as had been the case with the Roosevelt and the Fram. Slowly she was carried westward in the relentless ice-grip, through about thirty degrees of longitude, to a point northeast of Wrangel Island, where finally the cracking and shifting of the ice close about her brought the doom which all had been expecting. Her side was crushed in, her hull filled, and a little later the ice jaws opened and let her down. Her contents had been removed to solider ice, and Capt. Bartlett added fitting ceremony to the closing scene by putting Chopin's Funeral March on the victrola and starting the machine just as the water began to wash over the deck.

By dint of such labor and perseverance as must characterize all Arctic exploration, Capt. Bartlett and his men finally succeeded in transferring their effects to Wrangel Island. Four men, Dr. Alister Forbes Mackay, physician to the expedition; Dr. Henri Beuchat, of Paris, anthropologist; James Murray, of Glasgow, oceanographer, and Stanley Morris, a sailor, unwisely asked permission to attempt their own rescue independently, and perished. Three of the others died on Wrangel Island before the arrival of a rescuing party, early in September, 1914. Capt. Bartlett, with one Eskimo attendant, had made his way to the mainland and finally to St. Michael's, Alaska, where a wireless station gave him contact with the outside world and thus made possible the rescue of the Wrangel Island party. There is no indication that Capt. Bartlett's spirit has been broken by the disastrous fortunes of the expedition. The north wind and the ice can take the lust of Arctic exploration out of a seaman who has once caught it just about as successfully as "schrecklichkeit" can take the courage out of a Briton or a Frenchman on the field of battle.

Notes

THE following forthcoming publications of Robert M. McBride & Company are announced: "Dick Judson, Boy Scout Ranger," by George Frederick Parks; "The Torch-Bearers of Bohemia," by V. I. Kryshanovskaya; "Martin Valliant," by Warwick Deeping; "Cabins, Camps, and Cottages," by Richardson Wright; "How to Make Concrete Garden Furniture and Accessories," by J. T. Fallon, and "The Effective Small Home," by Lillian Bayliss Green.

The Century Company will shortly publish "The Stingy Receiver," by Eleanor Hallowell Abbott.

Early publications of Paul Elder & Company are announced as follows: "Victory Crowned," compiled by Page Fellowes, introduction by Horatio Dresser, and "Scientific Singing," by E. Standard Thomas.

The following volumes are included in B. W. Huebsch's list for early publication: "A German Deserter's War Experience"; "Poe," by Hanns Heinz Ewers, and "Municipal Ownership," by Carl D. Thompson.

Alfred A. Knopf announces for publication at an early date the first instalment of 1917 Borzoi books; "Brian Banaker's Autobiography"; "Backwater," by Dorothy Richardson; "Mutual Aid," by Prince Kropotkin, a new and cheap edition, and a translation of Kornilov's "Modern Russian History."

PUTNAM'S list for early publication contains the following announcements: Volume I of "The Cambridge History of American Literature," edited by Professors W. P. Trent, John Erskine, Carl Van Doren, and S. P. Sherman; "Visions and Beliefs in the West of Ireland," by Lady Gregory; "Antony Gray—Gardener," by Leslie Moore;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Business Competition and the Law," by Gilbert Holland Montague; "In Canada's Wonderful Northland," by W. Tees Curran and H. A. Calkins; "Bullets and Billets," by Captain Bruce Bairnsfather; "The Revolt in Arabia," by C. Snouck Hurgronje; "One Thousand Things Mothers Should Know," by Mae Savelle Croy; "Mrs. Norton's Cook Book," by Jeannette Young Norton; "Spanish Architecture of the Sixteenth Century," by Arthur Byne and Mildred Stapley, and "Spanish Glass," by Edwin Atlee Barber. The Putnams, acting as the American representatives of the Cambridge University Press, announce the publication of the following volumes: "Nature Study Lessons Seasonally Arranged," by J. B. Philip; "The Monks of Westminster," introduction by E. H. Pearce, and "Testimonies," Part I, by Rendel Harris.

A TEACHER in Sir Rabindranath's model school at Bolpur, Mr. W. W. Pearson, has written an account of the institution under the name of "Shantiniketan" (Macmillan; $1.50). We are glad to get this, though any attempt to imitate the spirit of the school would only add to the confusion of our present much-disturbed educational ideals. The whole thing reads like the story of an intellectual picnic, though no doubt these docile boys of the East get through a good deal of work between hymns to nature and ecstatic hearkenings to the singing of birds. We wish Mr. Pearson had told us a little more precisely what they actually study. Included with this description of the school is the translation of a story by Satish Chandra Roy, a pretty tale invented for the delectation of the children.

RUPERT BROOKE won his fellowship at King's College, Cambridge, in 1913 by a dissertation, "John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama," which is now published by the John Lane Company ($1.50 net). It contains five chapters entitled The Theatre, The Origins of Elizabethan Drama, The Elizabethan Drama, John Webster, Some Characteristics of Webster; and ten appendices dealing with the dates and authorship of the plays attributed to Webster. Students of the drama will find various challenges to their scholarship in the matters relegated to the appendices; but the chief interest of the book at the present time is in the light which it throws upon the figure of the young poet who has so recently gone, under his freshly gathered laurels, singing into the darkness. Rupert Brooke handles the business of scholarship and criticism with the assurance and untamed insolence of a very young man who abominates pedants and is surcharged with a sense of his own independence, his unconventionality, his ruthless realistic vision. He adores the "glorious atheism" of Marlowe; he is angry at the "impudent attempt" of Dr. Ward and Professor Schelling "to thrust the filthy and degraded standards of the modern middle-class drawing-room on the clean fineness of the Elizabethans." What he means by the "clean fineness of the Elizabethans" it requires a thumping paradox to explain: "The Elizabethans liked obscenity; and the primness and the wickedness that do not like it, have no business with them." In other words, æsthetic criticism involves for him simply the delighted understanding of his subject. He seeks to reproduce Webster's "essence." "This essence," he says, "generally presents itself more or less in the form of a view of the universe, recognizable rather by its emotional than by its logical content." The emotional content of Websterian drama he presents in this wise: "A play of Webster's is full of the feverish and ghastly turmoil of a nest of maggots. Maggots are what the inhabitants of this universe most suggest and resemble. The sight of their fever is only alleviated by the permanent calm, unfriendly summits, and darknesses of the background of death and doom. . . . Human beings are writhing grubs in an immense night." Such is the summed evidence for Rupert Brooke's main thesis: "The end of the matter is that Webster was a great writer." And our conclusion is that when Rupert Brooke was writing his dissertation his passionate nature, which could not feed on Elizabethan scholarship and was still unsure of an appropriate outlet in poetry or active life, luxuriated in imaginary violence and took pleasure and pride in the black morbidity of his insight into life.

"GERMAN Atrocities from German Evidence" (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin), by Joseph Bédier, translated by B. Harrison, is one of the series of Studies and Documents on the War, published by a committee of which M. Ernest Lavisse is the president. It consists chiefly of extracts from the diaries of German prisoners, confiscated "as being military papers," with eighteen plates reproducing the original documents. Only forty out of a continually increasing number were examined for this purpose, but a book is in preparation by the Marquis of Dampierre "in which the greater part of these roadside journals will be minutely described, copied, and brought into the full light of day."

A MOST interesting pendant to that striking book "J'accuse" (reviewed in the *Nation*, September 23, 1915), is "Précisément parce que je suis Allemand," by Hermann Fernau (Lausanne: Payot et Cie.; 1.50 fr.). This French version of a German original is provided with a preface by the editors, who deny categorically the various charges made in Germany, that the author is a Polish Jew, an army-deserter, that he is identical with the writer of "J'accuse," etc. Herr Fernau, they assure us, is a German who was forced to leave France at the outbreak of the war; he is also, according to them, a diligent seeker after the facts who refuses to subordinate love of truth to national prejudice. This fits in admirably with the tone of the book, which is one of seemingly candid innocence, though to the more sophisticated reader it may appear to be sustained and subtly veiled irony. The author examines certain German replies to "J'accuse" and finds them all evasive. He therefore appeals to the German world at large to meet those accusations with equally cogent reasoning, in default of which a verdict of guilty will have to be pronounced. On one point he is particularly incisive: any attempt to seek the causes of the war in the more or less remote past must be rejected as beside the point. The war is not the product of an immaculate conception, but is the result of the assertion of the will to power by certain individuals. The crime of passing from the potentialities of conflict to actual warfare was committed in the last weeks of July, 1914. The pertinent question is, who were the perpetrators of that crime? Herr Fernau still awaits an answer.

IN a small volume with the pretentious title "The Soul of the Russian" (Lane; $1.25 net), Marjorie and Alan Lethbridge have gathered together various short sketches

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of life and travel in Russia, many of them reprinted from the periodical press. The style is chatty and entertaining, with occasional suggestive aphorisms: "'Ah, we Russians!' sighed the old lady, 'we say nothing will happen and when it does happen we say that we don't know why it did happen.' Which is the Russian character in a nutshell." The authors should attain their aim, "to whet the appetite of the reader to know more about Russia." As is customary with English writers at the present time, they emphasize the genial side of the Russian character and are silent as to the abuses that formerly formed a staple of books on the country. The reaction is wholesome, so long as it does not fall into the fantastic adulation of Russian superstitious religiosity, of which Mr. Stephen Graham is the most prominent purveyor.

THE "Autobiography and Letters of Matthew Vassar" (Oxford University Press; $2 net) offers little in the way of fact that has not been already published in the late President-Emeritus Taylor's "Before Vassar Opened" and in his "Vassar," the latter written in collaboration with the editor of the present work. Neither does the book give a consecutive account of the life of the founder of Vassar College, or of his relation to the institution; for the autobiography is but a fragment, and the letters and diary jottings are scattered, failing to touch upon some of the most important moments. The volume does a better service, however, in giving a more vital impression of the founder himself than may be gained from other sources. The largeness of mind that in the 'fifties could conceive of women as equal in capacity to men, could embody this idea in a college giving them equal opportunity, and could insist on its being non-sectarian; the unselfish devotion and the business sagacity that could carry the enterprise to so successful an issue—these and other qualities have often been pointed out. But in reading the letters there emerges a new sense of these qualities as crystallizing out of a nebulous benevolence into a clearly defined human being, both enthusiastic and temperate, candid and tactful; kindly, humorous, affectionate; with largenesses offset by littlenesses; with humility, honor, vanity, pride. Not one of the letters, dealing with whatever broad general idea or whatever detail of college equipment, fails in an earnest, often an anxious, interest. Here enters what is perhaps the most engaging feature of the book and of the person. For this interest is not merely that of the creator in his handiwork; it is that of the sower whose seed springs up into harvest for himself as well as for others. At the end of the autobiography, after his zestful reminiscences of early youth, the bare mention with which the writer passes over "the most part" of his life as "filled up with ordinary business relations," and the deepening of tone with which he refers to the origin and history of his great idea, are not without significance. This able business man, unsatisfied by his lifetime of business, found its fruits meaningless unless put to some wide social use. In giving to others the opportunities which he himself had missed—he says of his own education, "I got none—scarcely to read and write"—he awoke to the fact that he himself was becoming educated. His touch with every phase of the organization of the college, his correspondence with persons prominent in the field, opened a new range not only of practical but of intellectual activity. The work taxed every power, and bent his physical strength to breaking; yet even through the letters in which the burden is most evident, the writer's sense of his own enlargement, mental as well as spiritual, is often manifest.

UNDER the title of "The International Crisis: The Theory of the State" (Oxford University Press; $1.25 net) six lectures recently delivered by a group of English publicists at Bedford College for Women have been put together in book form, with an introduction by Lord Bryce. The connecting thread between the various lectures has been a common endeavor to reëxamine the philosophic foundations of organized society, and to provide the intellectuals of England with renewed assurance against the "deadly theory which is at the bottom of German aggression." It is not that German and English theories are set in contrast, for England has had no theory of the state, at least none that has gained general acceptance among her students of political science. Yet the English mind is strongly enough wedded to individualism to afford a reasonably common ground for such discussions as "The State and Morality," "Might and Right," "Egoism, Personal and National," and the various other topics with which the book deals. The lectures cover a wide range and are of varying quality. Some are of a vigorously polemical type, hurling their darts of invective at the doctrines of Fichte, Treitschke, Nietzsche, Bernhardi, and the others whose names have become in these warring days a stench unto the nostrils of Englishmen. Others merely restate, in more or less defiant tones, the creed of a somewhat chastened individualism. All, however, are well put together and make instructive reading.

THERE seems to be something peculiarly British in the lifelong devotion to a particular spot, not by the humble and ignorant inhabitants, but by men of distinction and refinement. The English Lakes have for more than a century and a half been the object of wide admiration. The apostles of the picturesque in the earliest dawn of the romantic movement settled upon them as the ideal of wild nature and landscape. It may be surmised that Wordsworth and Coleridge and Southey were in part at least influenced by that tradition in settling in those traditional haunts of the romantic spirit. The Lakes have ever since held a memorable place in literary history, but it may be doubted if they have at any time had a more consistent and tireless lover than the Rev. H. D. Rawnsley, Canon of Carlisle. He has not only personally penetrated into even the most out-of-the-way recesses of that region, but he has pursued every strand of the subject, geological, archæological, and biographical, into remote ramifications. His latest volume, "Past and Present at the English Lakes" (Macmillan; $1.75), shows an undiminished ardor. The dozen papers are in general arranged so as to illustrate alternately the two phases alluded to in the title. After a personal narrative tingling with pleasure over the glories of sunrise on Helvellyn comes a fond recording of various reminiscences concerning Hartley Coleridge. In A Hundred Miles of Beauty, however, he displays the remarkable wealth of association, poetic and anecdotal, which the region holds for its lovers. Crossing the Sands combines the past and present in a different way, by relating first the history of that region from the dim past, and adding his own barefoot experience in that approach to the Lake Country. Possibly the best illustration of his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minute and exhaustive search into the region is the paper on Gough and his Dog, detailing every feature, from the mouth of every possible witness, of that incident of 1805 which enlisted the sympathy of both Scott and Wordsworth. The gossipy complications of literature have seldom been more pleasingly displayed. Every chapter bears witness to the power of genuine enthusiasm to interest and waylay.

From the Black Cat to the Academy—Maurice Donnay

IT is now just twenty-eight years ago, in January, 1889. The frequenters of the famous Chat Noir on the "sacred heights" of Montmartre had already enjoyed the usual round of sentiment, wit, and nonsense, in recitation and in song, when, forced to the piano by his friends, an unknown young man faced about and, amid generous applause, delivered himself of the following:

> Un nègre, étant prié chez son ambassadeur
> Et n'ayant pas d'habit, fut fort embarrassé.
> Il s'y rendit tout nu, bravant toute pudeur.
> Moralité:
> Le noir est toujours habillé.

It is possible that the member of the French Academy who is to visit us this spring may no longer relish the memory of this youthful effusion; yet Maurice Donnay has more reason than most to recall with pleasure, nay, gratitude, the evenings spent in laughter and song under the roof of the enterprising Rodolphe Salis.

Like Mac-Nab of the postal service, like Allais the druggist, Cros the physician, and Auriol the typographer, Donnay the engineer found there an outlet for his wit and an encouragement for his literary talent. He was a man of greater parts than they and, with Richepin, was soon to leave them behind; nevertheless he learned much in their company. He learned that to be tiresome is a deadly sin, that jesting is the rolling stock that carries ideas where preaching can never penetrate. He learned, in short, that a dramatist must first of all be an entertainer.

Donnay's plays go back to the entertainments of the *butte sacrée*, as those of Molière go back to the popular farce. They teem with episodic amusement—jibes, twisted sayings, parodies, and funny stories; any one who has heard Yvette Guilbert in her *gants noirs* can recognize them. And what is true of the part is true of the whole: certain plays, even in their entirety, are little more than large-sized versions of "Phryné," a facetious series of scenes in silhouette from antiquity, and "Ailleurs," a "review" of public men and public institutions—both written for the Chat Noir.

As is to be expected, one of Donnay's great qualities is a keen eye for the fads and abuses of contemporary society. We Anglo-Saxons rarely grasp the full bearing of apparently amoral comedies based on such observation; yet even the son of America can hardly fail to understand the intention of a picture so cruelly brilliant as that which forms the first act of "La Douloureuse." As the curtain rises, the audience sees a large room, flashily furnished. A lavish reception is in full swing. Men and women of various types are discussing the races, food, and one another. Glasses of all colors, champagne bottles, and piles of sandwiches attract those who find the crowd too great about the American bar. Rush, frivolity, and bad taste are the characteristics of this house, where no one knows with whom he is rubbing elbows, where no one expects to come again, and where all behave with the carelessness prompted by that thought. One of the guests is dubbed "le plus joli divorcé de l'année" and complimented on his divorce. To the host it is gayly suggested that, like a friend of his, he too may be in prison some day. At one table, the diners are already addressing one another by their first names; while, at another, Modest Flock is belying her name at the approach of each new admirer. Then suddenly there is a shot: the host has committed suicide. "Perhaps we ought to leave," says one diner. "We're not supposed to know," answers a second. "Why, all the restaurants are closed at this hour!" comments a third. "That's so," is the reply, "this is a very shocking affair; but, never mind, pass the roast beef, will you, Alphonse?"—"Sure, great reception this; lots of go!" And during these remarks and others like them the curtain descends with every one deciding to go on with the feast. Unfortunately the rest of the play is not equal in sprightliness to this first act, and taken as a whole "La Douloureuse" is disappointing. Donnay attempted in vain to develop a play of ideas out of this exposition à la Sardou.

Far superior is "Georgette Lemeunier." Again Donnay gives a brilliant picture of a certain class of society; but this time he makes it the background on which to draw a remarkable character. Affectionate and high-minded, sensitive yet courageous, Georgette defends her home and happiness against a dazzling and unscrupulous couple, M. and

THE NATION

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Published and owned by the
NEW YORK EVENING POST COMPANY

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President. JOHN PALMER GAVIT, Sec. and Treas.

EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second-class mail matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, Box 794, New York, Publication Office.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent Street, S. W.
WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building
CHICAGO OFFICE: 332 South Michigan Avenue
BUENOS AIRES OFFICE: Lavalle 341

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, EDITOR.

STANLEY WENT, ASSISTANT EDITOR. PAUL ELMER MORE, ADVISORY EDITOR.

WILLIAM G. PRESTON, ADVERTISING MANAGER. R. B. McCLEAN, BUSINESS MANAGER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mme. Sourette. Spurred by a sense of outraged honesty, this naturally retiring woman breaks into the midst of a crowded reception, finds Mme. Sourette, and, opposing to the false politeness of the experienced hostess a deference in which throb both irony and passion, arouses her husband from the spell that has been put upon him. But this is only a preliminary victory. Georgette is not the woman to suffer the least accommodation with evil. Her husband and his fortune are safe; but her ideals are shattered. No persuasion, not even the realization that her husband was all but guiltless, can still the shuddering of this honest character. The remedy must come from within, from herself; and it is a striking proof of his good psychology that Donnay has understood this, that he has called once more on Georgette's spontaneous courage to make her forget, in the excitement of another great scene with Mme. Sourette, the resistance of her own heart. Set off by the insincerity of those about her, Georgette stands out as an admirable figure of flesh and blood. She has a personality that charms and convinces, a personality which nothing but a seeing, or at least a reading, of the play can render. This power to create character is given to but few dramatists and of itself is sufficient to place Donnay high among the playwrights of to-day.

"The Past hangs like a lamp at the threshold of the Future, to lighten the shadows that envelop it." These words from Lamennais sum up Donnay's attitude towards the problems of modern society. It is to the past that he turns for enlightenment; it is the past that he sets up as the judge of the sanity and stability of modern fads and modern experiments. And in a whole series of his productions the past becomes a tyrant, to disregard whose discipline or injunctions means the ruin of persons, communities, and movements.

This is best seen in his sociological plays. Here the effect of the past on the present is evident in the outline of the plot. "La Clairière" is the story of a communistic experiment. This sort of Brook Farm contains many elements of success; but it is short-lived because, as an able critic has said, its foundations were laid on absolute logic, on theory and reasoning, and not on that relative logic that takes into account the anomalies of life as centuries of the past have taught men to live it. "Oiseaux de Passage" describes the love of a Frenchman and a Russian, a love born of common enthusiasm for liberty, equality, and freedom. But here again the past steps in: the barriers that bygone ages have built cannot be crossed with impunity, and this love is destroyed by the appearance of national traits that make the couple incompatible.

One might be tempted to attribute the rôle played by the past in these two plays to the collaboration of Lucien Descaves. But this attribution is gratuitous; for a third play, better than either of these and written by Donnay alone, is based on the same idea. This is "Le Retour de Jérusalem." Here, two years before the appearance of "Oiseaux de Passage," Donnay is already stressing the incompatibility of different races.

He has chosen to work out his theme in terms of ideals and manners. Michel, a Frenchman, and Judith, a Jewess, love each other sincerely. He is a scholar and a writer on humanitarian subjects; she a woman of great intelligence and many accomplishments. But when they come to live together, when they are brought into relations that call for sympathy of feelings and habits, rather than sympathy of mind, Michel's sensibilities are tortured. He is made to suffer in all that centuries of national life and humanitarian ideals have taught him to cherish—devotion to home, privacy, literary and artistic ideals, patriotism. Judith, in her turn, becomes more and more outraged also. Belonging to a race that has been homeless and persecuted for ages, she knows no such shackles; she lives by her mind alone and the ties she recognizes are those of race, not those of country. She becomes more and more impatient of Michel's inhibitions. He is ambitious, but will not catch the nearest way; he believes in universal amity, yet will do nothing to break down the distinction of nations; he believes in peace, yet he supports the army. Learning and study enlist his sympathy; yet, unlike Judith, he prefers the Parc Monceau with its dormant intellects and its ancient habits of civic and social life to the Quartier Latin with its Collège de France, its Sorbonne, and its libraries. Thus the couple drift slowly apart and come at last to realize that they are strangers. Education, associations, and tradition—the past with all that it implies—make their union intolerable. This play is strong, well constructed, and thoroughly dramatic. As the best of the sociological trilogy, it has earned for Donnay a place in the ranks of a distinguished class of dramatists. Like Lavedan, Bourget, Brieux ("La Robe Rouge"), and only a few others, he has succeeded in translating the vital questions of the day into the language of dramatic art.

In his thought, Donnay is, as we have seen, an enlightened conservative, one who is unwilling to forget the past though always preoccupied with the present. The same may be said of his style. At the very outset of his career, he showed a remarkable fondness for those sayings in which the French have crystallized the wit, the wisdom, and the history of their race; and throughout his work the frequency of purely literary allusions (to Horace, Boileau, Lafontaine, Hugo, Musset, Richepin) and a marked fondness for verse ("Lysistrata," "Folle Entreprise," "Ménage de Molière") reveal a man of traditional culture, imbued with that great characteristic of the French man of letters, a veneration for the French language. Donnay's style is a delight. Brieux has developed a manner of his own, lustreless, graceless, but forceful. Bernstein can scarcely be classed as a French writer at all, so inelegant, so coarse are his methods of expression. Donnay is not of these. Precise, clear, and effective, he belongs rather, if allowance be made for lifelike social dialogue, to the line of Voltaire, Maupassant, and Frédéric Masson. In the words of Filon, "il est plus écrivain que tous nos autres auteurs dramatiques excepté Lavedan et Lemaître."

As we look back over the dramatic production of Donnay (some twenty works), it is possible to trace the progress of his development. Beginning with the facetious mockery of contemporary society ("Lysistrata," 1892), he passed on to the portrayal of passion. "For those," says a contemporary critic, "who were of love's age at that time, *Amants* (1895) was a never-to-be-forgotten experience." Three years later appeared the successful combination of character and social setting ("Georgette Lemeunier"), followed in 1900 by "La Clairière," the first of the sociological trilogy. Finally, in 1912, the Comédie Française produced "Le Ménage de Molière." This is not, strictly speaking, a drama at all. For the time being, the scholar has ousted the dramatist, and Donnay, proceeding by tableaux and using an antiquated vocabulary, seeks to give us the per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal side of Molière, as he saw it when preparing a series of lectures on France's foremost playwright.

But these dates do not by any means divide the plays into homogeneous groups. Donnay returns frequently to a type which he had temporarily abandoned. Of the same year as "La Clairière" is "Education de Prince," the most frivolous of social take-offs; and "Le Ménage de Molière" was followed by "Les Eclaireuses," a satire on the feminists and thus recalling "Lysistrata" of twenty-one years earlier. Maurice Donnay, like all superior and practical dramatists, has sought both to satisfy his own artistic aspirations and to keep his grip on his audience. He has been flippant, merry, and, to our way of thinking, often unnecessarily unpleasant; but he has been serious and high-minded, too, working towards really artistic ideals and guided by fertile thought.

A. G. H. Spiers

Philharmonic Jubilee Concerts

When the Philharmonic Society of New York gave its first season of concerts, seventy-five years ago, it played to audiences aggregating about 900 persons. Last season 146 concerts were given by the same association in New York and in other cities, and these were heard by more than 290,000 persons. Such a growth and success were surely worth commemorating by a sort of festival. Accordingly the Philharmonic devoted last Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday to four jubilee concerts which included some interesting features. The first of these concerts had what is now known as a "Pulitzer programme"; that is to say, a programme made up of pieces by Beethoven, Wagner, and Liszt, the three favorite composers of the late Joseph Pulitzer, the Philharmonic's greatest benefactor, who, on bequeathing to it the sum of $750,000, expressed the wish that those three masters should be well represented. It was hardly necessary to voice this desire, for those masters have long been favorites of Philharmonic audiences. The very first concert given by this Society, in 1842, began with Beethoven's fifth symphony. The first of its great conductors, Carl Bergmann, was a devoted missionary for Wagner. When some one told him that the people didn't like Wagner's music, he answered: "Den dey must hear him till dey do." He also did a great labor of love for Liszt, beginning with "Les Préludes," in 1859. "It was he," says Mr. Krehbiel, in his history of this association, "who first brought his orchestral compositions to performance by the Society, and gave them many repetitions, so that they have come to be especially characteristic of the Philharmonic's repertory."

At the first of last week's jubilee concerts Liszt was represented by his "Faust" symphony, Beethoven by his third "Leonore" overture and his song, "Nature's Praise of God," arranged for male chorus and sung by the Mendelssohn Glee Club (which also coöperated in the "Faust"); and Wagner by his pompous but empty "Centennial March," which was written for Theodore Thomas's use at the Philadelphia Exposition in 1876. Wagner himself "sized up" this march well when he declared that the best thing about it was the $5,000 he got for it. To Theodore Thomas he justified his demand for so large a sum by referring to the $100,000 Verdi had received for his "Requiem."

By way of calling attention to the fact that the Philharmonic has been hospitable to French composers and also to Americans, the second of the jubilee programmes was devoted to the second symphony of Saint-Saëns, Paul Dukas's "L'Apprenti Sorcier," MacDowell's "Indian Suite," in which the red man's music is made so admirably to serve the white man's purpose, and the Symphonic Fantasie of one of the younger American composers, Henry Hadley. The third programme included the fifth of Beethoven's symphonies, with which the Philharmonic had made its début in 1842. It was preceded by one of the most interesting performances ever heard in New York—the singing of several of Bach's chorals and four parts of his great B minor Mass by Dr. Wolle's superb Bach Choir brought here from Bethlehem, Pa., through the generosity of Charles M. Schwab. It was probably the first time this unique Choir had been heard outside of Bethlehem; it was certainly the first time in New York that lovers of choral music had heard such thrilling choir singing, except when the Mendelssohn Choir of Toronto came here a few years ago.

Victor Herbert's "American Fantasie" closed the fourth programme. It was preceded by Debussy's Two Nocturnes for orchestra alone, the Theme and Variations from Tchaikovsky's third suite, and Dvorák's symphony, "From the New World," which was written at the time its composer was director of the National Conservatory of Music in New York. It is dedicated to the Philharmonic, and its first performance anywhere, by this orchestra, in the composer's presence and under the bâton of Anton Seidl, was the most memorable event in the Society's history. It has ever since been a chief battle horse; its present conductor, Josef Stransky, is fortunately as much in sympathy with it as was Seidl; and he has, of course—thanks to the generosity of Pulitzer—a much better orchestra than Seidl ever dreamed of. Stransky has technically improved the Philharmonic till it is second to no orchestra in the world. He conducts with authority and with emotional eloquence, and in point of variety, contrast, and comprehensiveness his programmes leave little to be desired.

Many distinguished men have helped him to build up the Philharmonic to its present eminence. Rubinstein, who was surprised by the excellence of American orchestras, once conducted his "Ocean Symphony" at a Philharmonic concert. Richard Strauss, the most prominent composer of our time, was one of the "guest conductors" heard by Philharmonic audiences. Others of these "guests" were Colonne, Wood, Kogel, Herbert, Weingartner, Mengelberg, Fiedler, Kunwald, Steinbach, all of them world-famed. Neuendorf, as well as Leopold and Walter Damrosch, held the post only a year each. Paur remained four years; but the three greatest of the Philharmonic conductors of the past were Theodore Thomas, Anton Seidl, and Gustav Mahler. When Mahler came the Society was already in a position to reward him properly for his work. But with Seidl and Thomas the hard work they did for the elevation of musical taste through the Philharmonic was largely a labor of love. In 1880 Thomas's share of the profits was $1,500. There were times, too, when, as he once wrote, he had enough work every twenty-four hours "to kill the average man." Stransky might say that of himself to-day, but he gets

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nearly twenty times as much for it as Thomas did at that date. The price of conductors went up long before the war.

HENRY T. FINCK

Finance

New Loans to Europe

THE $250,000,000 collateral loan of the British Government, announced in this market a week ago, bears 5½ per cent. interest, will run one year for part of it and two years for the rest, and will be sold at 99.52 for the shorter term and 99.07 for the longer. This compares with a 5½ per cent. rate, a three- to five-year term, on the $300,000,000 collateral loan of October, sold at 98½ to 99¼, and with a 5 per cent. rate for the similar $250,000,000 two-year loan, sold at 99 in August. The loan now impending will bring the total American holdings of foreign obligations, acquired since the war began, to something like $2,250,000,000. The annual interest payment on these securities will be fully $120,000,000, which should all be remitted to this country through the foreign exchange market.

Not the least interesting aspect of this situation is that on most of these foreign loans not only does interest become an immediate credit to our markets, but principal also falls due within a very brief period. Taking a calculation made three months ago by the Federal Reserve Board, and allowing for new loans placed since then, it will be found that, of the $1,700,000,000 European obligations held in this country, the maturities are thus arranged:

1917	$103,000,000	1920	$500,000,000
1918	360,000,000	1921	215,000,000
1919	510,000,000	1923	5,000,000

Of the remainder, the Reserve Board stated that they were banking obligations with maturity not stated.

What will be the effect of these enormous maturities on our markets, whether for money or for foreign exchange? In line with financial precedent, the natural result would be for the obligations to be either renewed or funded into another kind of loan. This idea is hinted at in the announcement of a "conversion privilege" for the $250,000,000 English bonds, now being offered, whereby they might be exchanged for some other Government security with a longer term to run.

But even with the general probability of conversion instead of cash payment, the power which the American market will necessarily possess, through these immense maturities in the next five years, has a very important bearing on the vexed question of "conditions after the war." That power will naturally be the greater in proportion as the war itself is prolonged, and our market's capacity and willingness to make fresh loans of the kind continue.

It is occasionally asked, both in and out of Wall Street, whether they can continue. Such doubt as exists on that matter arises mainly from perplexity as to how our home market, so lately dependent on Europe for part of the capital to run its own industries, can possibly provide the money. It must first be noticed, in the case of loans to the Allies, that only the capital put into the manufacture of materials sold to Europe has to be raised.

Purely from the economic point of view, what happens in this transaction is that our manufacturers make heavy sales to Europe; that they accept in payment one- to five-year obligations of the purchasers, and that these obligations are shifted to the American investing public. In so far as the public buys them entirely with its own money, the fact of its buying them shows its ability to meet the situation. In so far as the foreign bonds are bought with borrowed money, the abnormally large gold imports provide the reserve basis for the credits granted. In either case, the money raised at home is spent at home.

The possibility of danger lies in overdoing the use of credit and bank funds for the purpose. The remark has frequently been heard during the past month, even on Wall Street, that the Federal Reserve Board had opposed the floating of any more European loans in the American market. This has never been the fact. Since the Board's famous declaration of November 27, on the plan of selling foreign Treasury bills to our banks and on certain aspects of the investment in foreign bonds, the Governor of the Board has publicly stated that it had "intended in no way to slight the financial status of any foreign country," that it had merely meant to "prevent confusion of the discount and the investment markets." Shortly before the November declaration, one member of the Board, speaking at a bankers' convention, had pointed out, as a distinct advantage of the investments, "the extraordinary ability of this country to protect itself against any violent loss of gold by using . . . some part of the extensive holdings of European securities which we have recently acquired."

All that the Federal Reserve Board itself said in November regarding foreign Government bonds was this:

> The Board does not consider that it is called upon to advise private investors, but as the United States is fast becoming the banker of foreign countries in all parts of the world, it takes occasion to suggest that the investor should receive full and authoritative data—particularly in the case of unsecured loans—in order that he may judge the future intelligently in the light of present conditions and in conjunction with the economic development of the past.

There is no fault to find with this, considered as general advice. The reason why it gave rise to the sweeping inferences which the Board itself had to discountenance was that the paragraph is obscurely worded, and was so placed in the context as to appear to indicate something dangerous to investors in the whole series of foreign loans.

We have been living, during the two-and-a-half past years, in a period when the financial market's point of view is shifted with such bewildering rapidity that it is difficult to recall to-day our own attitude even of six months or a year ago. Our acceptance, as a matter of course, of incidents which, a little distance back, would have seemed incredible, is an inevitable consequence. But that the Government of Great Britain, whose 2¾ per cent. bonds sold at 113 in 1897, should be offering 6 per cent. net for interest on a foreign loan, while putting up Stock Exchange collateral against it, would have appealed to the financial mind, three years ago, as a very wild flight of the imagination. That it has happened may conceivably mean a change in the financial position of England in the longer future. Yet it may also have the very temporary significance which attached to the selling of United States 6 per cents, in 1863, at a price which, allowing for the premium on gold, was equivalent to little more than 50 cents on the dollar.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION

Berger, M. Ordeal by Fire. Putnam. $1.50 net.
Grey, Z. Wildfire. Harper. $1.35 net.
Hudson, W. H. A Crystal Age. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Jacobs, W. W. The Castaways. Scribner. $1.35 net.

MISCELLANEOUS

Baker, H. T. The Contemporary Short Story. Heath.
Bowman, I. The Andes of Southern Peru. American Geographical Society. Holt.
Cosmos. The Basis of Durable Peace. Written at the Invitation of the "New York Times." 30 cents net.
For the Right. Essays and Addresses by Members of the "Fight for Right Movement." London. T. Fisher Unwin. 5s. net.
James, W. On Vital Reserves. Holt. 50 cents net.
Twombly, F. D., and Dana, J. C. The Romance of Labor. Macmillan. 75 cents net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Boodin, J. E. A Realistic Universe. Macmillan.
Brown, C. R. The Master's Way. Boston: Pilgrim Press. $1.75 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Britain Transformed. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 6d. net.
Countess of Warwick. A Woman and the War. Doran. $2 net.
Hake, T., and Rickett, A. C. The Life and Letters of Theodore Watts-Dunton. 2 volumes. Putnam.
Jörgensen, J. False Witness. Doran. $1 net.
Low, S. Italy in the War. Longmans, Green. $1.75 net.
May, M. B. Isaac Mayer Wise. Putnam. $2 net.
Root, E. Military and Colonial Policy of the U. S. Harvard University Press.
Ross, M. and N. Light and Shade in War. Longmans, Green. $1.40 net.
Shelton, W. H. The Jumel Mansion. Houghton Mifflin. $10 net.
Sir Walter Raleigh. Edited by F. C. Hersey. Tercentenary Edition. Macmillan. 50 cents.
Swope, H. B. Inside the German Empire. 1916. Century. $2 net.
The Cellar-House of Pervyse. A Tale of Uncommon Things from the Journals and Letters of the Baroness T'Serclaes and Mairi Chisholm. Macmillan. $2.25 net.
Tod, J. Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han. Vols. I and II. Dutton. $4 net set.
Washburn, S. The Russian Advance. Doubleday, Page. $1.25 net.

Ready This Week

Creative Intelligence

By **JOHN DEWEY and Others.** *$2.00 net.*

This book should appeal to philosophers as being the first considered *pronunciamento* of the pragmatists as a school, and to the public at large as linking philosophy, so far too remote, with the life of every man and of every day.

CONTENTS: The Need for Recovery in Philosophy—By John Dewey. The Reformation of Logic—By A. W. Moore. Intelligence and Mathematics—By Harold C. Brown. Scientific Method and the Individual Thinker—By G. H. Mead. Consciousness and Psychology—By B. H. Bode. The Phases of Economic Interest—By H. W. Suart. Moral Life and the Construction of Values—By J. H. Tufts. Value and Existence in Philosophy, Art, and Religion—By H. M. Kallen.

The Philosophy of William James

By **T. FLOURNOY.**
Translated by **EDWIN B. HOLT** and **WILLIAM JAMES, Jr.** *$1.40 net*

This is the authorized translation of what is, perhaps, the best critical study of William James yet written. The book contains just enough biographical material to give unity to a discussion of opinions and creeds always in process of development, and is otherwise an exposition, clear and distinguished in style.

The translation is the work of men who were intimate with James, both personally and professionally, and does full justice to Professor Flournoy and to the subject.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY 34 W. 33d St., New York

Hygiene in Mexico

A Study of Sanitary and Educational Problems

By Alberto J. Pani

12°. Charts. $1.50 net. (By mail, $1.65.)

An investigation by the ex-Director-General of Public Works in the City of Mexico by the express order of Carranza. M. Pani says: "The purpose of this book is to expose one of the least-known, most nefarious, and shameful inheritances of the past, in order that it may be uprooted with the most intense energy of which Government and society in general are capable."

All Booksellers

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York **London**

THE VALLEY OF DECISION

A Plea for Wholeness in Thought and Life

By the Rev. E. A. BURROUGHS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. Pp. xx+391. $1.60 *net.*

"A stimulating book which should be widely read."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"It is a book—we had almost written 'the book'—for the present crisis. It is cogent and persuasive; it is discerning and illuminative: its teaching is comprehensive and thorough."—*London Diocesan Magazine.*

" 'The Valley of Decision' is a great book on a great subject. It is marked by earnestness, plainness of speech, and self-restraint. . . . Mr. Burroughs has the vision of a seer, the intuition of a philosopher, the mind of a ripe scholar, and the burning zeal of a Christian patriot."—*The Record.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

A HISTORY OF ECONOMIC DOCTRINES

By CHARLES GIDE and CHARLES RIST.

The scope of the work includes the period from the time of the physiocrats to the present day. Especial prominence is given to the development of economic doctrine during the past 25 years.

Cloth. Octavo. 695 pages. **$3.00.**

D. C. HEATH & CO., Boston, New York, Chicago

By James Joyce, a new Irish writer

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man

The spirit of modern Ireland is implicit in a naturalistic story of home, school and college.

$1.50 net.

B. W. Huebsch, Publisher, New York

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lists of Publications in sciences, philosophy, philology, history, economics, will be sent upon request.

The University of California Press
BERKELEY, CAL.

READING CASE FOR THE NATION

To receive the current numbers in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with "The Nation" stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. **THE NATION, 20 VESEY STREET, NEW YORK**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of the News

PRESIDENT WILSON'S personal address to the Senate on Monday was unheralded and unexpected. After a brief announcement of his desire to the Vice-President and to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Wilson came to the upper chamber with a message which in many respects is the most significant of his utterances since the outbreak of the war. Insisting that the United States shall play a part in laying the foundations of permanent peace among the nations, the President disclaimed any desire on the part of the American Government to "throw any obstacle in the way of any terms of peace the Governments now at war might agree upon, or seek to upset them when made." Only he expressed the belief that the future peace would not be secure unless based upon conditions satisfactory to both parties to the conflict. With perfect neutrality he pleaded for the freedom of the seas as a principle to be established and for a limitation of armament on land. And as a guarantor of permanent peace he suggested an extension of a principle analogous to the Monroe Doctrine to the entire world, by means of a force, contributed by all nations, so much greater than the force of any combination now engaged, or any alliance hereafter formed or projected, that no nation or probable combination of nations could face or withstand it."

SIGNIFICANT in the President's speech is the passage recommending for "every great people now struggling towards a full development of its resources and of its power" "a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea." If this cannot be effected by the cession of territory, it is suggested that it might be obtained "by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will secure the peace itself." An important principle laid down in the President's message as being essential to a lasting peace is the consent of the governed. "No right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were cattle." As an instance he cited Poland, which he inferred should hereafter be independent and autonomous.

A NEW note supplementary to the recent Allied note was presented to the State Department on Wednesday of last week by the British Ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice. It bore the signature of the new British Minister for Foreign Affairs, Arthur J. Balfour, and gives evidence of having been written by him. The purpose of this special communication was to amplify and reinforce certain objects which the Allies are striving to achieve in prolonging the war. Special attention is given to the plan to expel the Turks from Europe. Although admitting that the maintenance of the Turkish Empire was for many generations regarded as essential to European peace, the note insists that circumstances have now completely changed. Turkey, in the hands of Germany, is no longer a bulwark of peace and has become an instrument of conquest. The massacres in Armenia and Syria are cited as evidence of the Turk's intolerable rule. The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France and of Italia Irredenta to Italy, a subject which was only hinted at in the Allied note, is now definitely emphasized. The present note lays down three conditions which are held to be essential to a durable peace. "The first is that existing causes of international unrest should be as far as possible removed or weakened; the second is that the aggressive aims and the unscrupulous methods of the Central Powers should fall into disrepute among their own peoples; the third is that behind international law and behind all treaty arrangements for preventing or limiting hostilities some form of international sanction should be devised which would give pause to the hardiest aggressor." And it concludes with the expressed belief that these conditions cannot be fulfilled unless peace is obtained on the general lines indicated in the joint note.

A GERMAN sea-raider, whose operations in the South Atlantic had been vaguely reported for a fortnight and more, made its presence definitely felt when on Thursday of last week news came from Brazil that the Japanese vessel Hudson Maru had put into Pernambuco, at the order of the raider, carrying crews of the destroyed boats to the number of 337. The number and fate of all the detained ships are not as yet known. Early reports mentioned twenty-three vessels in all as having fallen victim to the German warship, but at least two of those listed, the Drina and the Ortega, have since reached port. The papers of Saturday printed an official statement from Berlin to the effect that the English steamer Yarrowdale had been brought into a German port on December 31 by a prize crew of sixteen men. She carried 469 prisoners, being the crews of one Norwegian and seven English ships. The Yarrowdale sailed from New York on December 4, having war materials and food for the Allies.

THE capture of the Yarrowdale has brought in question Germany's right under international law to treat as prisoners of war neutral sailors aboard enemy merchantmen. On Sunday Ambassador Gerard cabled the State Department a summary of the German Admiralty's statement on the matter. It is understood that according to the German view ships mounting guns, whether for defence or for offence, lose their status as private commercial craft. If the German reading of the law is correctly reported, the United States Government, acting in behalf of captured Americans, will be forced to come to an understanding with Germany as to the status of armed merchantmen—a question which has been up for discussion before.

A DEFENCE by Germany of her deportation of Belgians was presented to the State Department by the German Embassy on Saturday. The document, upon which we comment in our editorial columns, describes at length the benevolent purposes which have prompted this transgression of international law. Owing to the British blockade, it is said, economic conditions in Belgium have gone from bad to worse; industries that once flourished have ceased, and lack of employment is almost universal. It should be noted that the German report does not square with a recent outgiving of Cardinal Mercier, who asserted that of one company of forty men deported only two had been without work. Meanwhile, Pope Benedict has made representations to the German Government with a view to preventing further deportations. Meanwhile, also, Mr. Hoover, head of the Belgian Relief Commission, has arrived in this country for a brief visit and announces that the needs of Belgium are appalling.

AGAIN the Greek Government has yielded to demands made by the Powers of the Entente. A copy of Greece's reply to the Entente ultimatum was handed to the State Department at Washington on January 20. The demands included the following items: The reduction of Greek forces in Continental Greece, Eubœa, all the territories situated outside of the Peloponnesus to the number of men necessary to act as police, together with the transportation of all armament and munitions in excess of this necessity to the Peloponnesus. The prevention of reservists' meetings. Reëstablishment of Allied control. The release and indemnification of imprisoned Venizelists, and the offer of formal apologies to the Allied Ministers, as well as a solemn salute to the English, French, Italian, and Russian flags.

PRESIDENT WILSON has recommended to Congress the promotion of his physician, Dr. Cary T. Grayson, a Passed Assistant Surgeon, with rank of lieutenant-commander, to a Rear-Admiral. This would mean that he would be jumped over the heads of 137 officers who are his seniors. The Senate's attitude towards this recommendation is, as we write, still uncertain.

INQUIRY into the alleged "leak" was halted the middle of last week in order that the Rules Committee might have time to engage counsel. After a good deal of discussion from which partisanship was not absent the Committee on Tuesday selected Sherman L. Whipple, of Boston, a Democrat. The hearing was resumed on Tuesday, in New York.

SECRETARY DANIELS announced last week that he had awarded to the firm of Hadfield's, Limited, of Sheffield, England, a contract for the manufacture of 7,500 large armor-piercing projectiles for the United States navy. The amount of the bid was $3,141,000 and the contract calls for a delivery of the projectiles in sixteen to nineteen months. The highest American bid was $4,500,000, made by the Washington Steel & Ordnance Company. Secretary Daniels justified his course in turning to a foreign nation for this contract by a statement on Sunday in which he held up to ridicule the criticism of his patriotism made by home concerns.

IT was announced on Monday that more than 25,000 National Guardsmen would shortly be included in the movement of troops from the Mexican border. The plan now is to leave 50,000 militiamen for border duty.

AN experiment in education will be inaugurated next autumn at the Teachers College of Columbia University. Boys and girls between the ages of six and eighteen years will, as pupils in this school, be relieved of drill of the traditional sort. For Greek and Latin modern languages will be substituted and special emphasis will be placed upon those branches of science which lead to practical results. The experiment will be conducted under the auspices of the General Education Board.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED